1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA				
3					
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Docket No. CR05-5828FDB				
5	Plaintiff,) Tacoma, Washington) February 12, 2008				
6	VS.)				
7	BRI ANA WATERS, VOLUME 2				
8	Defendant.				
9					
10	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS				
11	BEFORE THE HONORABLE FRANKLIN D. BURGESS SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE, and a jury.				
12	APPEARANCES:				
13	For the Plaintiff: MARK N. BARTLETT				
14	ANDREW C. FRIEDMAN Assistant United States Attorney				
15	700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220 Seattle, Washington 98101-1271				
16	For the Defendant: ROBERT BLOOM				
17	Attorney at Law 3355 Richmond Boulevard				
18	Oakland, California 94611				
19	NEIL M. FOX Cohen & Iaria				
20	1008 Western Ave., Sui te 302 Seattle, Washi ngton 98104				
21					
22	Court Reporter: Teri Hendrix Union Station Courthouse, Rm 3130				
23	1717 Paci fi c Avenue Tacoma, Washi ngton 98402				
24	(253) 882-3831				
25	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by Reporter on computer.				

1	<u>I N D E X</u>				
2	OPENING STATEMENTS:	<u>Page</u>			
3	By Mr. FriedmanBy Mr. Bloom				
4	By Mr. Bloom 107 INDEX OF WITNESSES				
5	=======================================				
6	<u>WITNESS ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF</u> :	<u>Page</u>			
7	JOHN COMERY Direct by Mr. Friedman	150			
8 9	Direct by Mr. Friedman	202 202			
10	I NDEX - EXHI BI TS EXHI BI TS	<u>Page</u>			
11	No. 211	165			
12	No. 212-A No. 212-B	166 167			
13	No. 212-C No. 212-D	169 169			
14	No. 212-E No. 212-F	170 172			
15	No. 212-G No. 212-H No. 212-I	173 173 175			
16	No. 212-1 No. 212-L No. 212-M	173 177 178			
17	No. 212-N No. 212-O	178 180			
18	No. 213 No. 221	183 188			
19	No. 222-A No. 222-D	190 190			
20	No. 222-E No. 222-F	190 191			
21	No. 222-G No. 222-H	191 193			
22 23	No. 222-I No. 222-J No. 222-K	193 194 195			
23	No. 222-N No. 222-L No. 222-N	196 196			
25	No. 222-Q No. 222-0	197 199			
	No. 222-P	199			

			02
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	EXHI BI TS No. 222-S No. 223 No. 231 No. 232-B No. 232-C No. 232-C No. 232-F No. 242-B No. 242-C No. 242-B No. 242-F No. 242-F No. 242-F No. 242-F No. 252-A No. 252-A No. 252-B No. 252-B No. 252-B No. 252-B No. 252-C No. 262-C No. 282-C	INDEX - EXHIBITS	Page 200 202 207 209 210 211 212 213 215 216 216 217 218 218 219 222 225 226 226 227 227 228 229 230 231 232 235 236 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 244 245 246 247 247 248 249
23	No. 282-E No. 282-F No. 282-H		247 247 248

1 TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2008 - 9:00 A.M. 2 (Jury not present.) 3 THE CLERK: This is in the matter of United States of 4 5 America versus Briana Waters, cause CR05-5828FDB. 6 Counsel, please make an appearance for the record. 7 Good morning, Your Honor, Andrew MR. FRI EDMAN: 8 Friedman and Mark Bartlett for the United States. 9 MR. BARTLETT: Good morning, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Good morning. 11 Neil Fox on behalf of Ms. Waters, who's MR. FOX: 12 present. Mr. Bloom stepped out for a second. 13 THE COURT: All right. I guess we are ready to 14 proceed. 15 Let me mention one thing about the hours. As I mentioned, 16 8:30, if there's anything the Court should take up, I will 17 take it up at that time. Ms. Waters, that means the appointed 18 time I give the attorneys, I need you here also so you can 19 hear what is taking place. If I tell them 8:30, that means 8:30 for you, too, so you can hear everything that is going on 20 21 and taking place. 22 Mr. Fox, I will leave it up to you and Mr. Bloom to take 23 care of that end of it. All right. 24 MR. FOX: Your Honor, we had something briefly that I 25 talked to Ms. Miner about yesterday afternoon, and she

informed me that the Court's ruling actually took care of that issue, so I am not -- the reason I had originally to come early is now moot.

THE COURT: All right. I believe they pointed the order out.

MR. BARTLETT: There is one minor matter that won't take over a minute.

THE COURT: All right.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If I could note it to the Court. MR. BARTLETT: Yesterday for the first time we heard from Mr. Fox that during their trial they anticipated perhaps going into two areas; that agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation might have changed their testimony or tailored their testimony because they were worried about first an OPR, Office of Professional Responsibility investigation and/or a civil lawsuit based on their actions. I want Mr. Fox and Mr. Bloom to be aware if that issue were to be raised, which of course is totally within their realm and choices to be made, it is the government's strong position that that would open up the door to subjectively what our agents knew. For example, Special Agent Halla knows a huge amount of information that overwhelmingly leads to Ms. Waters' guilt, some of which -- a fair amount of which is not admissible during this trial.

For example, Chelsea Gerlach, before she was sentenced in Oregon, told us that she and Ms. Waters wrote the communiqué

In fact, in relation to that Oregon state action, she obtained the rental car, the car used in the action, just as she did for the University of Washington.

There are a number of other issues -- Ms. Gerlach, after she was sentenced in Oregon and got her deal, suddenly got cold feet and doesn't want to testify. But if the issue is what is in Mr. Halla's mind, is he worried about a civil lawsuit, is he worried about an OPR investigation, he of course would have to explain to the jury that, "No, I am not worried about it, because I know all of these other things that lead me to conclude beyond any doubt that Ms. Waters is guilty."

That is an area, obviously, that we would love to get into, but I want them to be aware of, they might want to tread lightly, Your Honor. If it's brought up in the opening statement, we would plan to introduce it in our case-in-chief.

THE COURT: I mentioned about the complaint, and the Court's position on it. They assured me that that would not be an issue, that it would not be raised. So I would hold them to that. Mr. Bloom is not here, and I am sure Mr. Fox, being his cohort, will explain all of this to him. If it comes up, then the Court has got to rule on it.

So I will deal with that when there's an issue. Right now it is premature for this court to deal with anything like

that. So I will wait and see what happens. If it becomes an 1 2 issue, so be it. I can't control that. It sounds like the ball is in the defendant's court, so we will see what happens. All right. Are we ready for the jury now to opening? 5 Your Honor, I guess I am concerned because MR. FOX: Mr. Bloom left briefly because he forget something at his 6 7 hotel, and he's not here. I don't know what to say at this 8 point. 9 THE COURT: You can repeat what I said. 10 MR. FOX: Can we wait 15 minutes? 11 THE COURT: Mr. Bloom -- I can't go on his schedule. 12 It seems like he's got a schedule I am not approving of. 13 We are going to start. I will give you a couple minutes, 14 because I am sure we will have a break once the government has 15 given their opening. Then you and Mr. Bloom can have your 16 tete-a-tete as to this whole thing. 17 MR. BARTLETT: Could I grovel a little bit, Your 18 This is going to be a long trial. On appeal, if there 19 is an appeal in this case, I don't want to have to deal with 20 an issue involving Mr. Bloom not being here during the 21 openi ng. I know the Court is very concerned about wasting the 22 23 jurors' time, as is the government. We want to get this case 24 over as soon as possible, but if we could indulge just perhaps

10 minutes, maybe we could make it up later in the day.

25

1 THE COURT: Mr. Bloom -- I don't have a rope to tie 2 him to things. 3 MR. FOX: Neither do I. He seems like he's got his own marching 4 THE COURT: 5 orders. The intent as I see, he moving in a way I don't buy. 6 MR. BARTLETT: He indicated that he forgot his 7 openi ng. 8 THE COURT: He said, I believe the word that got to 9 me, was seven minutes away. Well, by whose count? Your Honor, I don't normally like to 10 MR. FOX: 11 apologize for things I haven't done, but I will apologize on behalf of Mr. Bloom. And I would ask the Court --12 13 THE COURT: Are you also asking me to repeat what I 14 just said to him so he can be here to hear this? 15 MR. FOX: I will tell him that. But I think it would 16 probably be ineffective assistance of counsel under the Sixth 17 Amendment for the person giving the opening statement not to 18 be present during opposing counsel's opening statement. 19 THE COURT: When I tell you folks to be here at 8:30 20 and be prepared and you can't remember to either put your 21 clothes on or bring --22 MR. FOX: Your Honor, you are asking me --23 THE COURT: Well, you are evidently speaking for him. 24 MR. FOX: I am at this moment, and I apologize. 25 THE COURT: Let's take a recess. See if you can find

1 hi m. 2 THE CLERK: All rise, Court is in recess. 3 (Brief recess.) (Jury not present.) 4 5 THE COURT: All right, you may be seated. MR. BLOOM: First, apologies; I forgot my notes. 6 7 THE COURT: He's apologized for you but we will talk 8 about that. Are we then ready to proceed? 9 MR. FRI EDMAN: We have one issue concerning exhibits 10 Mr. Bloom intended to use in his opening. We had raised 11 yesterday, and the Court ruled on our motion to prevent the 12 defense from using notes taken by agents during interviews and 13 reports written by agents during those interviews, because 14 they are not likely to come in. They would only come in if 15 they were prior inconsistent statements. We don't expect 16 My understanding is Mr. Bloom intends to hand write the that. 17 same exact thing and do that. I think it's a clear invasion 18 of the Court's order. We wanted to give a notice that we 19 object to that, and we ask the Court to instruct him that he 20 not be permitted to do that. 21 THE COURT: I mentioned to all of you in the pretrial 22 conference what was permissible. I also cautioned you about 23 what you may refer to in opening that may be problematic down 24 the line. I am not going to ask you to build into the record 25 doing something I told you not to. If that's a consequence

you have to offer, you will suffer it down the line.

Let me say one thing too -- obviously it's 9:30. I wanted to have the jury in the box at 9:00. You said you forgot your notes. From here on, I want you here at 8:30. You and your client. And we will take up anything that needs to be taken up. If you are not here, Mr. Bloom, the Court is going to proceed. I am giving you notice that I expect you to be here unless I get a call that you got hit by a truck out there or something, then I am going to proceed.

Mr. Fox was here and he was ready to go. He pleaded your case very well but that's not the issue, because he's raising questions about whether it's an issue of right to counsel and all of that. Those issues are being raised.

I assume, and is it fair to say he's talked to you about what I said about all of that?

MR. BLOOM: Not yet. I just got here.

THE COURT: Do you understand what I am saying? I want to start on time, and I want you and your client here to do that.

MR. BLOOM: Sure.

THE COURT: She's here. I don't want to have to run around and try to find you or have the Marshals try to track you down or do anything like that. Okay?

All right, let's bring the jury in.

25 (Jury present.)

THE COURT: You may be seated.

Okay. Good morning to you. I trust my admonitions to you, that you went home and didn't talk about the case, that you complied with those requests.

I just want to say a couple things to you before the parties get a chance to argue, and give you their opening statement as to what they intend to present to you in the course of this trial.

The way the case will be run is after they have done that, will be the presentation of witnesses, where the government will get a chance to call their witnesses first and examine those witnesses, and the defense will get a chance to cross-examine those witnesses as to their testimony. The evidence that you are to consider here would be the witnesses, their testimony as to what took place here, any documents or exhibits that are admitted by the Court for your consideration, and any stipulations between the parties as to any fact.

The evidence can be circumstantial or direct. They all carry the same weight and it is up to you to determine what weight to give that. What is not evidence is the argument of counsel, the objections they may make to questions that may be asked, and how the Court rules on those -- that's not evidence. The evidence will come by the way I mentioned: The witnesses, the exhibits and the stipulations. You are to

determine the credibility of the witnesses, that is who to believe, and who not to believe based on what that person knows about what they are talking about, able to see and hear, and how they obtain that knowledge; able to describe and recall all of those matters, and how reasonable the testimony would be. You are to make all those assessments as the witnesses are called to testify, as you are the finders of fact here as to what took place.

As to the sentence, the matter is to for the Court to decide what that matter should be.

Keep in mind at all times, the defendant is presumed innocent. The burden of proof is on the government. They have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that this person, this defendant, is guilty of anything.

With that, now, you will hear the opening statement. The law as to the specific instructions as to what you are to apply to the facts you find, will be given to you at the close of the case.

We will start with the government first, in terms of opening statement, and then you will hear from defense counsel.

MR. FRI EDMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

May it please the Court: Between 1997 and 2001, a group of extremists blazed a trail of destruction across the states of Washington and Oregon.

They acted under the banners of the Earth Liberation Front and the Animal Liberation Front, and they claimed that they were protecting the environment. They were acting to protect animal rights. But what they did was they selected buildings, facilities that they thought hurt the environment and animals, and they attacked them and they burned them and destroyed them.

They didn't worry about the danger that their action caused for firefighters, for people who might have been inside the building. They ignored the devastation that their actions caused for the lives of all the people associated with the building, people that worked there, people in the community. And they paid no attention to the fact that the large fires they set actually hurt the environment.

Instead, they just took it upon themselves to assume that they were right and they were entitled to burn what they wanted to. And they left a trail of destruction; there is no doubt about that.

In 1997, they burned a facility named Cavel West in Redmond, Oregon. You should have a picture on your monitors that shows what they did to Cavel West. They totally destroyed it.

A few months later, that same year, they burned a Wild Horse corral in Burns, Oregon, a facility operated by the Bureau of Land Management, and they destroyed that.

The next year, 1998, they burned two facilities here in Washington, both in Olympia, both facilities operated by the Department of Agriculture -- something called the National Wildlife Research Center, and another building, the Animal Damage Control Center. They burned those both the same night.

A year later, 1999, they burned Childers Meat Company, again in Oregon -- a meat packing company that they opposed, and they totally destroyed that.

Later that year, they burned a building belonging to Boise Cascade, a timber company, also in Oregon.

In 2001, they burned the headquarters of Superior Lumber Company, another timber company in Oregon.

In the spring of 2001, they conceived their biggest attack yet. They planned to commit two arsons the same night, one in Oregon, one in Washington, hundreds of miles apart, but coordinated.

They thought by burning two things the same night in different states they would show the movement was growing; they would show they were gaining ground. They would show they were making progress towards their goals. They called it the double whammy. And they assembled two teams to commit these fires, five people for each one.

The team that was to burn the University of Washington was headed by someone named William Rodgers, who was really the leader of this group, and you'll hear a great deal about him.

1 He went by the name Avalon. That's what others in the group 2 knew him as.

There were five people in that group: William Rodgers; the defendant, Briana Waters -- there were five people: Avalon; the defendant; her boyfriend at the time, who's named Justin Solondz; and two other women, one Jennifer Kolar, and one named Lacey Phillabaum.

They plotted their action for weeks. They built complicated fire bombs in a building at the house that the defendant rented.

The defendant had her cousin rent a car so that they could drive from Olympia, where she lived, to Seattle to attack the Center for Urban Horticulture.

The evening before the arson, they drove that car up to Seattle. After dinner, they drove to the Center for Urban Horticulture. It's right near Husky Stadium, near the University of Washington, near a residential neighborhood. They parked in that residential neighborhood. There's a small hill, and they parked basically a block into the neighborhood on a hill looking down at the University.

The defendant stayed in some bushes at the end of the street, with a radio, to act as the lookout. The others circled around behind the building, broke into the office of Toby Bradshaw, a professor at the center and a target of their actions. At one point a policeman came by, and the defendant

radioed the others to warn them, but he left without noticing anything.

They set their fire bombs. They radioed the defendant to come pick them up. She did, and the group left.

At about 3:15 that morning, the fire broke out. The fire bombs that they had left went off and set the building on fire. It caused a huge fire.

You'll hear from two of the firemen who responded who were there fighting the fire that night. They will tell you it was something called a 311, a three-alarm fire, the biggest fire that they had fought that year. Flames were 75 feet in the air above the building. It took hours to control the fire, and by the time the firemen finally put it out, the building was totally destroyed.

What the defendant and her accomplices did that night was wrong in every way. Their target was a professor named Toby Bradshaw. They attacked him because they believed he was conducting genetic engineering of poplar trees, and they opposed that.

And you will hear from Professor Bradshaw during this case. He wasn't conducting genetic engineering of poplar trees; he was cross-breeding trees the way farmers have done for hundreds of thousands of years.

And the defendant and her accomplices didn't just destroy Professor Bradshaw's office, they destroyed the whole building. They destroyed the offices and the labs of all of the other professors who worked there.

And you will hear from a couple of those professors. You will hear from a woman named Sarah Reichard. Her research was dedicated to conducting risk assessments that foreign species, foreign plant species, might invade and displace native plant species. She was trying to protect native plant species. And her office and her laboratory were destroyed.

You will hear there were populations in the building of endangered native plants destroyed. A library of rare botany books dating back hundreds of years -- books were damaged.

If there was one building in Seattle that helped the environment, it was probably the Center for Urban Horticulture, and yet the defendant and her accomplices decided they had the right to burn it, and they burned and destroyed it.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you probably remember from yesterday, my name is Andrew Friedman. Seated next to me at counsel table is Mark Bartlett. We are both federal prosecutors.

Also with us is Special Agent Ted Halla from the FBI.

He's the case agent for this case. That's the person who is responsible for investigating, gathering evidence, and you will hear from him during the course of the trial about a number of subjects.

During the course of the trial over the next two or three weeks, we will prove to you that the defendant was one of the five people who participated in the plan to burn the Center for Urban Horticulture; that she was one of the five people present on the night of the fire, one of the five people who did this.

We will prove it through the testimony of Lacey Phillabaum and Jennifer Kolar, two of the people who were there that night. Each of them will come in and they will tell you they were one of the five arsonists; they were one of the people that did this. And each of them will tell you that the defendant was with them. She was one of the people with whom they committed this crime.

We will prove it to you through other evidence, documentary evidence and physical evidence that links the defendant to the other members of this group, to the other four people, and it links them to this crime.

Among that evidence was the rental record for the car.

The defendant was the person responsible for coming up with the car for this action, and she convinced her cousin to rent that car.

You will see the record for that rental, and you will hear the testimony of her cousin who say that she suggested it; that they rented it. That on the evening before the arson, she showed up and took that car. She told them something

about where she was going that wasn't true. And she didn't reappear until after daylight the next day.

She took that car to Seattle with Avalon, with Jennifer Kolar, with Lacey Phillabaum, and with her boyfriend, Justin Solondz, and burned the University of Washington.

I want to begin by giving you some background about the Earth Liberation Front, which I will sometimes call ELF, and the Animal Liberation Front, ALF. Some of you may have heard of these groups, some of you may not have heard of them.

These are groups that claim that they are trying to protect the environment and animals, that that's their goal. But they are not like the Sierra Club or the Audubon Society. They don't lobby. They don't participate in the political process. They don't hold demonstrations or protests. They claim all of those actions are ineffective. But if you really want to change, you have to do more than that. There's only one way to do that, and that's to cause damage and harm to people with whom you don't agree. And the best way to do that is to burn their buildings. So what these groups do is they advocate, they encourage, they commit arson.

Because they are committing crimes, they are not like traditional organizations. There's no membership role, there's no public list of who belongs, there's no president and secretary. They are organized in cells, groups of five to perhaps a couple dozen people. And the members of a cell know

each other, but they don't know the members of any other cell.

The point of that is that if one cell is discovered, if one cell is exposed, those are the only people who are caught, and the rest of the group goes on committing their crimes. It's a classic structure for a terrorist or a guerilla organization.

Now, I said a moment ago that there's no central hierarchy, there's no president. There's one exception to that rule. These groups are trying to further an ideology, a position, and so they need publicity; they need people to know about what they are doing, and so they actually do have -- each one has a press office. And you are going to hear about an individual named Craig Rosebraugh in this case. During much of the relevant period he was the press officer for ELF.

When the members of a cell commit an action, when they commit a crime, they write a communiqué that says what they did, and it has some information in there that proves they are the people that did it. There will be references to the type of fuel or to the specific method by which they burned a building. And there's an explanation of why they did what they did -- a criticism of the thing that they are attacking and a threat to do it again if the victim doesn't change his behavior.

Once they write this communiqué, the communiqué is usually delivered anonymously to the press officer. It's sent to him,

and he then posts it on the web or disseminates it to reporters, spreads it around, so that people will know what the Earth Liberation Front -- what ELF has done or what ALF has done, and so they will change their conduct.

The fires that I told you about when I started are all the products of one cell. It was a prolific cell. It was headed by Avalon, by William Rodgers. There were as many as approximately 20 members in this cell. The defendant was one of those members.

You are going to hear a lot about Rodgers during this case. He wasn't formally the head, but he was the leader; he was the person who set direction for the cell, and you are going to hear a lot about that.

He was also an important figure in ELF overall. He wrote a variety of manuals and books on fire, on arson. He wrote a document called "Setting Fires with Electrical Timers." A how-to guide, basically, to teach others how to commit arsons. And that document, you will see, was recovered both from him and ultimately posted on ELF's website. It was posted on the ELF website so other cells and other people could follow Rodger's example and commit crimes.

The way in which the members of this cell committed their crimes made it extremely difficult to solve these arsons.

They went to tremendous lengths in preparing the crimes, in committing the crimes; tremendous lengths to conceal their

identities, and to prevent themselves from being caught.

Initially, they conducted research to select targets, to figure out what they wanted to attack, targets that would be the type of target they could attack without being caught -- in many cases, isolated targets in rural areas.

After they had selected a target or during the process, they performed reconnaissance. They would go and scout the target, drive by, figure out the lay of the land, figure out how they were going to do it, when was a good time to attack the target when people wouldn't be there. Then they built complicated fire bombs -- incendiary bombs to use in their attacks.

You are going to hear a great deal about those, and you are going to hear about the evolution of those over time, but essentially they all followed a simple model. They started with a timer; sometimes a mechanical timer, sometimes a digital timer, so that there would be a time delay. People could set the bomb and leave before the fire broke out.

The timer would run for whatever time it was set, and when it finished that time, it would complete a circuit. That circuit typically had a battery in it, and so as soon as it's complete, current flows from the battery. It would flow to either a light bulb from which the glass had been removed or a model rocket igniter.

The current would heat those up, and those were placed

right next to books of match heads in most cases. They would light the matches, and so you would get a strong, sudden, hot fire.

The matches would then go to the next step, be connected to the next step; sometimes a sponge soaked in gasoline, sometimes a road flare.

Ultimately, that next step was placed next to a gallon jug of fuel or buckets, open buckets with fuel; gallons and gallons of gasoline and diesel mixed together.

In many cases, the defendant and her coconspirators used multiple devices, each one with as much as ten gallons of fuel.

Even in building these devices, they took tremendous care not to get caught. They didn't just build these in the backyard or their living room. They would set up clean rooms, rooms designed to avoid leaving any physical evidence linked to the fire bombs. They would spread plastic on the floor. They worked using gloves and shower caps, everything they could do to prevent leaving hair, fingerprints, DNA on the fire bombs.

Once everything was ready, the members of this cell would get dark clothes, dark top, dark pants, dark shoes, gloves, usually hats. They'd often perform a dry run, go to the target maybe the night before, maybe the week before; go through what was going to happen, because these actions

weren't committed by one person. Each one was a team, done by a team, often four to five people, and every member of that team had a specific role.

There would be a lookout with a radio. The other members would have radios. If the lookout saw something, they could warn the others. The team usually had a scanner or scanners so they could monitor law enforcement, see if anyone was coming by, monitor the response.

There were people whose role was to help carry the devices, to get them to the scene, people whose role was to set the devices. These were carefully planned and coordinated actions.

Finally, on the night of the action, they would head to wherever it was supposed to be; typically arrive there in the early morning hours, maybe 2:00 or 3:00; set their fire bombs and leave. And the fire would go off. By the time the fire went off, they were safely away.

Finally, because they were so successful in using fire bombs and designing fire bombs that worked in setting fires, they typically destroyed the target; they destroyed most of the evidence they left behind. You are going to see pictures of burned fire bombs, burned devices. Even if the clean room wasn't successful, the fire destroyed fingerprints, other forensic evidence that might have been there.

Because of all these steps, it took law enforcement years

to solve these crimes. Agents worked -- the task force from different agencies worked for years trying to figure out who had committed this series of crimes. For years, they didn't make any progress.

In 2004, three years after the last fire I talked about, seven years after the first fire, agents finally got a break. They developed enough evidence to convince one of the members of the cell to cooperate with them, and he began to provide information. As he did, they began to figure out who other members of the cell were, and the whole thing started to come apart like a chain of dominoes. They started to figure out who had committed the different crimes, to solve the different crimes, to figure out who was involved.

The arson at the University of Washington was a hard one to solve. The first break in that case didn't come until 2005. In 2005, investigators learned that a woman named Jennifer Kolar had participated in Cavel West, the very first arson they talked about that took place back in 1997. They approached her and suggested that they had evidence that she had committed that crime, and Ms. Kolar decided to cooperate. She came in for an interview. She got a lawyer and came in for an interview.

And investigators didn't promise her anything. She was in a serious situation. They told her that she was looking at potentially a very long sentence. The penalty for committing

the University of Washington arson with a destructive device could be a 35-year mandatory minimum.

Ms. Kolar had actually committed other arsons. She was potentially looking at even more. The investigators didn't promise her anything. They said, all we can tell you is your situation will be better if you cooperate, and we would like you to cooperate.

And Ms. Kolar came in and she gave an interview, and she talked about several of the arsons in which she'd been involved.

She said that the one that she had the least clear memory, though, was the Center for Urban Horticulture arson at the University of Washington. She recalled that she had committed that arson with William Rodgers and several other people, and she talked about other names in connection with the arson. She talked about someone who went by the name Capitol Hill Girl. She speculated about Capitol Hill Girl's boyfriend and someone by the name of Crazy Dan.

And there's no dispute in this case, on the first day -this is December 16 of 2005 -- on the first date that she was
interviewed, Ms. Kolar never mentioned the name Briana Waters.
There's not going to be any dispute about that. Everyone
agrees.

Three weeks later, her lawyer called the government and said that Ms. Kolar recalled the name of the lookout. That in

addition to herself and William Rodgers, she recalled that Briana Waters, the defendant here, was the lookout for the arson at the University of Washington.

This was the first time investigators had ever heard Ms. Waters' name. She wasn't a target of this investigation; she wasn't even on the radar screen. It was the first time her name came up in any significant way. And investigators began to investigate her.

You will see that within days of that conversation, Agent Halla was requesting record checks, he was pulling her driver's license from California, from Washington. He was beginning to try to figure out who was Briana Waters.

He was also continuing to investigate the case. I told you that the whole cell was coming apart, like a chain of dominoes falling down. Agent Halla continued to interview other people.

By mid February, he had concluded that Lacey Phillabaum was one of the other arsonists. At that point Jennifer Kolar still hadn't identified her, but Agent Halla concluded that she was probably one of the other five arsonists.

So over the weekend of February 18 to the 19th, Agent Halla contacted her family. Investigators told her, told her father, that we had evidence that she had committed this crime and asked her to come in and cooperate.

It was the same situation as Ms. Kolar. She wasn't given

any specific promise. She was told that her situation would be better if she cooperated, and asked if she would do that.

On February 21, Ms. Phillabaum and her lawyer came in and gave an interview. Ms. Phillabaum talked about the University of Washington arson, and she confirmed that she had committed that, and that she was one of the arsonists. She had done it with William Rodgers, Jennifer Kolar, the defendant, and she provided the fifth name. She had done it with the defendant's boyfriend, Justin Solondz.

During the course of this trial you are going to hear from both Ms. Kolar and Ms. Phillabaum. Since those initial interviews, they have entered into plea bargains. They will tell you about those. Ms. Kolar is going to receive a sentence of five to seven years under her plea bargain.

Ms. Phillabaum is going to receive a sentence of three to five years. They will come in on the stand and they will tell you about what happened back in 2001 and their role and the defendant's role.

And you are going to see a lot of other corroborating evidence. I am going to talk about some of that for a minute and give you some more detail, a summary of what Ms. Kolar and Ms. Phillabaum will tell you.

You are going to learn that the defendant originally was from Pennsylvania. She came to the State of Washington in 1997 to attend classes at the Evergreen State College in

Olympia. While she was there, she became involved in environmental and animal causes.

In 1998, she was the coordinate of a group called the Evergreen Animal Rights Network, EARN. While she was coordinator, that group actually hosted Craig Rosebraugh, a spokesman who came up and gave a speech there at Evergreen.

You are going to hear that the defendant also became very close to Mr. Rodgers. The way we know that is from Mr. Rodgers' cell phone. In addition to his true name, William Rodgers, and Avalon, the name he used within the movement, William Rodgers used a third name. He was living under the name Todd Hager. The reason he had that identity was to further distance himself from his true name, because he was involved in this criminal activity. He was trying to hide.

He rented his house in the name Todd Hager, and his landlord will come in and tell you that's how he knew him, and show you the checks, the money orders that he used to pay his rent in the name of Todd Hager.

Mr. Rodgers apparently hadn't established that identity fully enough to get a cell phone, and he wanted a cell phone. Presumably he thought he needed a bank account or credit card, or something like that. In any case, he couldn't get a cell phone himself, and so he turned to the defendant.

She was a poor student at the time. She didn't have a

car. She didn't have the money to get a cell phone for herself. But she got a cell phone in her name, and over time, she paid the bills for that cell phone. And you will see checks from her for that cell phone. But it wasn't her cell phone, it was William Rodgers'. She gave it to him.

You will see various evidence that proves that it was William Rodgers' cell phone. It shows up in address books as Avalon's phone number. Jennifer Kolar will tell you that William Rodgers said that's my phone number; that she called that number and spoke to him.

So when Avalon needed help getting a cell phone, when he needed help hiding, when he needed help concealing his identity, the person to whom he turned was the defendant. The cell phone is important in another way because if you look at the calls, they also show you just how close the defendant and Avalon were.

If you look at who was called on that cell phone, there were regular calls to locations in which the defendant was living. She's one of the people he called the very most, perhaps the person he called the very most.

By 2000 Avalon had big plans for his cell. He was trying to grow it. He wanted to grow the movement. He wanted to commit bigger arsons. He wanted basically to scale things up.

One thing he needed to do that, is he organized a series of movements. You will hear them called book club meetings or

study group meetings. These were meetings that typically had 10 to 15 people. There were a series of them, about five of them held in different locations. Most of the people, the same from meeting to meeting.

MR. BLOOM: Could you repeat that? I didn't hear that.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Most of the participants, the same between meetings.

MR. BLOOM: Thank you. I didn't hear it. I'm sorry.

MR. FRIEDMAN: The meetings were held in Eugene, in Arizona, in California, in Olympia, and in a location, Sisters, Oregon.

These meetings started out fairly general. People talked about what was a worthwhile thing to work on, a worthwhile campaign. Should we be working on environmental issues? Should we be focused on genetic engineering? What's something bad that we should focus on? And over time, they selected the target of genetic engineering.

They also got much more tangible as things went on. They went from philosophical discussions to practical, hands-on discussions. People talked about how to do reconnaissance, how to pick locks, how to get into buildings, how to communicate by encrypted email, how to build fire bombs.

They even had a workshop, a demonstration during which some of the people who knew how to do it built fire bombs, and

the others practiced soldering and trying to build fire bombs. And these meetings served as a ground -- a group from which to recruit people into the cell, people to participate in these actions.

I want to be clear about something. The defendant didn't actually attend any of those meetings. Avalon didn't need her to go to those meetings because he already knew her well. He could recruit her directly.

In addition to these meetings that were designed to grow the movement, the group started to focus on genetic engineering. Of all of what they perceived the evils out there, they decided genetic engineering was the thing they needed to work on. For some reason, they focused on genetically engineered poplar trees. They thought that was a threat that they needed to deal with.

And because they were focused on that, they focused on three professors -- three entities. They focused on someone named Steve Strauss, who was a professor at Oregon State University. They focused on a company, Jefferson Poplar Farm, in Oregon. And they focused on a professor, Toby Bradshaw, at the University of Washington. Professor Bradshaw's office, of course, is in the Center for Urban Horticulture. These became the targets, the people that they were starting to focus on.

In March of 2007, members of the group attacked several plots of poplar trees in Oregon. These are trees being grown

by Professor Strauss as part of his research. They did something called girdling or ring barking them, basically cut rings around the bark to kill the trees, and they killed hundreds of trees.

By May things had gotten more serious. That's when they were planning the coordinated attack on Jefferson Poplar Farm and the University of Washington.

You are going to hear during this case from both Jennifer Kolar and from Lacey Phillabaum. They will each tell you that they were approached in early May. At the time, Lacey Phillabaum lived in Eugene; Jennifer Kolar lived in Seattle. Each of them was invited to come to Eugene for some meetings related to an action. And they both came on the weekend of May 12th to the 13th. That's about ten days before -- eight days before the arson was actually committed.

They will tell you about their trips there and the meetings they held. There were two sets of meetings that went on that weekend, one for the people who were going to commit the University of Washington arson, the other for the five people who were going to commit the Jefferson Poplar arson.

Both Ms. Kolar and Ms. Phillabaum went to the University of Washington meeting, and they recall the defendant being there.

Lacey Phillabaum will tell you that the first meeting she recalls was basically an introduction that took place at a Denny's restaurant where she was dropped. She thinks that's

the first place she ever saw the defendant, because she remembers feeling like she was meeting her there.

There were meetings after that in a field or park, in a library or building connected to the library at Evergreen, and Lacey Phillabaum recalls the defendant being at those. She remembers her being in the field because they had a discussion about whether this action would be claimed in the name of the ELF, that is, whether they would say it was an ELF action or whether they wouldn't use that name.

Lacey Phillabaum thought the defendant would back up her position in that, and she was surprised when the defendant didn't.

They made plans that weekend for how they were going to commit the action. They talked about how much fuel they were going to use. There was some debate over how much fuel would be necessary.

They talked about how they were going to get in the building. The plan was that Jennifer Kolar was taking a class having to do with stained glass, and so she knew how to cut glass and had glass cutting tools. The plan was to have her cut the glass in Professor Bradshaw's windows so that they could get in through there.

They assigned roles for that. Everyone was responsible for getting their own clothes, their own dark clothes for the action. Justin Solondz was responsible for building the fire

bombs. The defendant was responsible for coming up with a car to use for the action, a rental car that wouldn't be traceable to any of them in case they were spotted.

Lacey Phillabaum recalls that the defendant said she was going to have an aunt rent the car, although Lacey Phillabaum didn't necessarily understand that that meant a true biological aunt. She understood it to mean a female to whom she felt close; perhaps a relative, perhaps not.

At the end of the weekend, everyone went home to make their own preparations. Jennifer Kolar practiced cutting the glass. Justin Solondz worked on building the fire bombs. The defendant worked on getting a rental car.

The next weekend, Lacey Phillabaum will tell you she came back to Eugene -- back to Olympia. And she went to the defendant's house. This is a house where the defendant was living. It was a separate building out back.

Justin Solondz took Lacey Phillabaum and the defendant into that building, and set up a clean room in there where he was building the fire bombs, and he showed them the fire bombs. Lacey Phillabaum thought he was trying to make it so that everyone was responsible, everyone was part of it, and they had ownership of them just as much as he did.

On Sunday evening, sometime in early evening, the group drove up from Olympia to Seattle and they went to a restaurant, the Greenlake Bar and Grill, and had dinner there.

Jennifer Kolar, who lived in Seattle, met them at the Greenlake Bar and Grill. At some point after dinner, they drove over to the University of Washington neighborhood. They parked in a residential area, a block from the Center for Urban Horticulture -- it's a small hill that looks down across a busy street to the center, and they got out of the car and walked to the end of the street.

There's a bush at the end of the street, and you will see pictures of this. There's a bush that is kind of at the end of the cul-de-sac and has a clear view down the field and to the center, and the defendant stayed there with a radio. Her job was to be a lookout from that spot.

The others walked down the hill. They walked around sort of in a large circular group. They were all wearing dark clothes. Because this was in the city, because it wasn't out in the country, they didn't wear hoods for this. They were trying to look like students but wear dark clothes. And they had backpacks and they were carrying -- instead of open buckets, they had built devices using Tupperware containers and Rubbermaid containers. They walked in a big loop and came around the area behind the Center for Urban Horticulture. It's a wide open area basically just north of Lake Washington and Ship Canal.

They came to the building probably sometime after 2:00. At one point a patrolling policeman who worked at the

University of Washington came by and went into the area and patrolled the Center for Urban Horticulture, and the defendant radioed to the others to warn them that there was a policeman there. But he didn't see anything and he left.

You will hear how Jennifer Kolar went up to the window and cut the glass with her glass cutting tools. That was supposed to be quiet and allow them to get into the building without being noticed.

It didn't quite work that way because one of the panes crashed to the ground. Lacey Phillabaum remembers how loud that was when it happened. They all hunkered down and waited and hoped no one would notice, and no one did.

So after a time they went back up to the building, and Avalon climbed in the window. They scouted it so they knew exactly which window was Professor Bradshaw's. The others handed in the fire bombs that they had built, and Avalon set those fire bombs. He must have set the timer for a little bit after 3:00.

When they were set, he came back out of the building and they radioed to the defendant, told her they were done and asked her to come pick them up, and they walked back in roughly the direction from which they had come.

The defendant picked them up and they drove back towards Greenlake. They dropped off Ms. Kolar, and they stopped at the Greenlake park -- I don't know if any of you know that

it's a lake in the middle of Seattle with a park around it -And they waited there. They waited until morning because they
didn't want to drive back to Olympia in the middle of the
night. They thought they might be seen, thought there might
be cameras on the road. And they waited for morning rush hour
traffic before they drove back to Olympia.

At some point they used their scanner and they listened to the firemen and policemen responding. Lacey Phillabaum will tell you she could hear fear in the voices of the firemen as they fought the fire. She will tell you about how Avalon was excited at what he was hearing. He was like a little boy playing with fire. The defendant's good friend Avalon, excited at the destruction that he caused and the fear in the people responding.

The fact that you are going to hear from both Lacey
Phillabaum and Jennifer Kolar is obviously significant in this
case. I told you a few moments ago that arson is an unusual
crime. These people had taken tremendous steps to avoid
getting caught, and they set a fire that totally destroyed the
building, the scene of the crime. So they didn't leave behind
physical evidence that would help locate them, but they left
behind other evidence.

After the interviews with Jennifer Kolar and Lacey
Phillabaum, Agent Halla continued his investigation. He'd
been investigating this case for years, and he continued to

dog the investigation. And that investigation resulted in a bunch of other evidence about which you are going to hear, and I am going to focus on several of those pieces.

Fist, he asked Jennifer Kolar and Lacey Phillabaum if they had anything left from those days, anything they used for the arson.

Jennifer Kolar had a blue tub. It didn't have things that she had used in the arson, but it had papers that she had saved from her days in the cell. It had red lights, which were lights you could use at night without being seen easily that people would use; walkie-talkies, things like that.

Agent Halla looked through and found a manila folder in there with a collection of articles in it. And there was a note on the inside of the folder that said, "Hey, woman, take a look at this. We will talk later," and there was a heart and the letter B.

Agent Halla thought that might be significant, and he asked Jennifer Kolar about it. She said she thought she had gotten that from Briana. And inside those articles -- there were a variety of articles, but there were a number of articles about the Earth Liberation Front and the Animal Liberation Front. And there were even articles about the fires at Jefferson Poplar Farm and the University of Washington.

Agent Halla took that folder and those articles and he

sent them to the FBI laboratory to look at. And they looked at them. They checked them for fingerprints. And on the folder, they found the fingerprint of Briana Waters.

So she didn't leave her fingerprint at the scene of the crime, but she did leave her fingerprint on evidence of the crime, an article about the very crime she had committed with Jennifer Kolar that she had given to Jennifer Kolar.

Also, Agent Halla developed evidence that Justin Solondz, after finishing -- he was also a student at Evergreen. After finishing, he moved to a small town called Brinnon on the Olympic Peninsula, and he lived in a small cabin there. He had apparently taken a lot of papers there from his days as a student and left them there.

Agent Halla got a search warrant and searched that cabin, and he found some evidence in there that was quite interesting. He found a bag with black hats and shower caps, exactly the sort of hat that you would use in building devices in the safe room, in committing this type of action.

And he found a map of Seattle. It's a 24-panel map, and it was folded open to the one panel that shows the Center for Urban Horticulture. Justin Solondz had no connection with the University of Washington, and yet he had a map in his cabin folded open to the scene of the crime, the spot where he and the defendant burned the Center for Urban Horticulture.

Agent Halla also followed up on the piece of information

about the rental car. If you remember, Ms. Phillabaum said that the defendant had come up with the rental car and had talked about having an aunt rent the car. Agent Halla tried to figure out everyone who might be that aunt, everyone who was close to the defendant, everyone whom she might have asked to rent a car for her. And he went to every rental car company that he could find to see if any one of the people on his list had rented a car from any company. He found a record that showed that a woman named Kara Larson rented a car.

The arson in this case happened in the early morning hours of May 21, 2001. That's early on a Monday morning.

Ms. Larson rented the car on Saturday morning, May 19, two days before the arson, in Olympia, from Budget. And it had been returned -- it was registered as being returned at 6:33 a.m. on Tuesday morning, the day after the arson. It showed approximately 200 miles, enough miles to drive from Olympia to Seattle and back.

You will hear that that 6:33 time is probably not actually the time it was returned. It was an after-hour drop. If the car is dropped off after hours on Monday, it would be registered in at 6:33 on Tuesday. So the car was likely returned in the evening hours on Monday, the evening after the arson.

After he found these records, Agent Halla interviewed Kara Larson and her husband, Robert Corrina. He'd already spoken

to them before. He learned that Robert Corrina is the defendant's first cousin. So Kara Larson, I guess, is the cousin by marriage. I am not sure what we call that exactly.

When he'd interviewed them previously, he'd asked whether they had rented a car for the defendant, whether the defendant had ever asked them to rent a car, and they hadn't recalled ever doing that. But when he presented them the records that showed the car rental for that weekend, they did recall that they had rented a car for her. Mr. Corrina will come in here, in court, and he will tell you what he remembers about that.

The defendant had lived with him for a number of months during 2000, the year before the arson -- not sure exactly which months, but stayed with him for a number of months.

When she moved out she left a bunch of boxes and other stuff in his basement.

Mr. Corrina recalls that the week before the arson, or the week before the car rental, which is what he really recalls, the defendant telephoned him, suggesting that he rent a car. And they discussed the fact that if he rented a car, it could be used to move her boxes out of his basement, which was something he wanted. Mr. Corrina also didn't have a driver's license, and so he went to his wife, who had a driver's license, and had her rent a car. They rented that car in the morning, Saturday morning, May 19.

Mr. Corrina recalls that on Sunday, May 20, the evening

before the arson, the defendant showed up at his house. She said she felt sick. She had a serious stomach pain and she needed to go to the emergency room. And she said that her boyfriend, Justin, was nearby but didn't have his car. You'll learn during this trial why he didn't have his car, because Susan Savoie, who is one of the people who committed the Jefferson Poplar arson, will tell you that she was driving his car that evening to commit that arson.

So the defendant showed up at her cousin's house and said she felt sick; he needed to go to the hospital, and wanted to take the car to go there.

Mr. Corrina thought that was a little odd because she didn't look sick, didn't see any sign that she was actually in pain. When Justin Solondz showed up, they didn't seem to actually be in any great hurry to go to hospital. After a while they left.

Mr. Corrina couldn't check to make sure his cousin was okay. He has one phone in his house, a cordless phone. He looked around for the headset, and he couldn't find the headset for the phone. He couldn't make any phone calls. He stayed up for a while, and the defendant never showed up back at his house. Eventually he gave up and went to bed.

When he woke up the next morning, the defendant still wasn't back. He recalls that sometime during daylight the next day, the defendant showed up back at the car -- back at

his house with the car. When she came in, she said she hadn't been able to get into an emergency room in Olympia, so she had to drive up to Seattle.

You will hear in this case from people who work at the emergency rooms in Olympia that there's no record that the defendant tried to get into the emergency room; that if she had actually tried to get into an emergency room, there would be a record. They don't turn people away because of insurance problems. They don't turn people away because they are too busy if they have a serious problem that needs to be treated.

So what the defendant told her cousin was a lie, and the reason she told him that is because she was driving that car to Seattle. She rented that car, or she had him rent that car, just as Lacey Phillabaum and Jennifer Kolar said, to commit this arson, and she rode in that car with them to Seattle to participate in that arson.

Mr. Corrina will also tell you that when the defendant showed up, she reached into the front of her sweatshirt, pulled out the headset for his phone, and said, "Look at that. What do you know, I took that by mistake." And the reason she did that, of course, was so that he couldn't contact her and check where she was while she was in Seattle committing that arson.

For her conduct, Ms. Waters is charged with five crimes in this case. She's charged with conspiracy. Conspiracy is just

a fancy legal word for an agreement. She's basically charged with agreeing with the other members of her cell, or conspiring with them to commit three crimes: First, arson; second, making destructive devices, fire bombs; and third, using those devices to commit arson.

She's also charged with two counts of arson. The reason she's charged with two counts of that is for arson to be a federal crime there has to be basically a jurisdictional hook. So the arson of a building that receives -- belongs to something that receives federal money is a federal crime. The arson of a building involved in interstate commerce is a federal crime. And so she's charged with two counts of arson, one each way.

You will hear evidence from the professors and from an official at the University of Washington that show that this was a building that was receiving federal funding, that was involved in interstate commerce.

She's charged with aiding and abetting the possession of a firearm, destructive device. And she's charged with aiding and abetting the use of that device to commit the crime of arson.

I should be clear; I didn't use the phrase "aiding and abetting" when I talked about arson. She was charged with aiding and abetting the arson because she wasn't the person who actually set the bomb, but she was the person who provided

the place to do it, who came up with the car and who served as the lookout, who served as the get-away driver, who was part of the team.

When I started talking about what you are going to learn about Ms. Waters during the case, I talked about when she came to Evergreen and the speech that EARN, the Evergreen Animal Rights Network had, the speech by Craig Rosebraugh that they sponsored, and in a way that brings us full circle. Because if you remember the folder filled with articles that Jennifer Kolar -- the folder of articles that had been selected by the defendant -- given to Jennifer Kolar by the defendant, there were articles in there about ELF and ALF, and there was an article by Craig Rosebraugh. And that article talked about the success that ELF and ALF had, the fires they had done already. But it said they needed to do more, and I want to read you a bit from it.

It says, "While the Earth Liberation Front has been shown to have had quite an impact in the United States since 1997, its targets have arguably been limited in nature... Using economic sabotage, the group has inflicted well over \$34 million in damages on entities profiting off the destruction of the environment. But is this enough.... If an individual desires to engage in economic sabotage, she or he should pick the best target possible.... Then the best tactic should be chosen to ensure that the most damage will be done.... Think

```
Wall Street, the stock market, the Statue of Liberty,
 1
    bi g.
 2
    the U.S. Capitol.
                       Mt. Rushmore, Disneyland, media
    conglomerates, military installations, government agencies."
        The evidence you will hear in this case shows beyond any
 4
 5
    doubt that the defendant did exactly what Craig Rosebraugh was
 6
    advocating, exactly what her close friend Avalon wanted.
 7
    escalating, by moving from a rural target to a large
8
    university building, in a big city, she was thinking big.
                                                                She
    was trying to escalate.
10
        And at the end of this case, we will ask you to return the
11
    only verdict consistent with the evidence, a verdict that
12
    Briana Waters is guilty of each of the crimes with which she's
13
    charged.
14
        Thank you.
15
             THE COURT: All right. Let's take the morning recess
16
    now before you hear the opening from the defense counsel.
                                                                So
    leave your books on the chair, and don't discuss anything
17
    about the case. Take a break, and I will have you back in
18
19
    here in about 15 minutes.
20
             THE CLERK: All rise, Court is in recess.
21
        (Morning recess.)
22
        (Jury not present.)
23
             THE COURT:
                         Mr. Bloom, are you ready for your
24
    openi ng?
25
             MR. BLOOM:
                         Yes.
```

1 THE COURT: All right. Bring in the jury. 2 (Jury present.) 3 THE COURT: All right. You may be seated. Now you will hear the opening statement from the 4 defendant. 5 6 Mr. Bloom. MR. BLOOM: Thank you, Judge Burgess. I am pleased 7 8 to be able to speak to you and tell you what we have to say. 9 First, I want to genuinely thank you for taking however 10 long this takes, two or three weeks -- even more if it turns 11 out -- of your lives. I think it is an experience that you 12 will actually cherish for the rest of your lives. It's a very powerful experience and one of the most important things that 13 14 American citizens can do. Understand, consider the evidence, 15 follow the law, listen to what the judge's instructions are 16 and listen to the evidence, not just the direct examination, 17 but the cross-examination -- everything. It's really 18 critical. Please reserve your judgment until you've heard it 19 all. 20 Not only has Ms. Waters pleaded not guilty, but she is not 21 guilty. 22 Let me introduce myself. I am Robert Bloom. My cocounsel 23 is Neil Fox. That's our client, Briana Waters. Completely 24 Completely not involved in this or any other arson. i nnocent. 25 We believe the evidence will show that there is a very

serious reasonable doubt, a doubt for which you can give a reason, or more than one reason, as to the government's proof. That's what's on trial here, the government's proof. In every criminal case in this country, it's about the government having the burden of proving, with credible evidence, beyond a reasonable doubt the facts that they allege.

As Judge Burgess has already indicated, we do not have the burden of proving anything. We will offer evidence; we will offer cross-examination, at the very least, for your consideration.

Every week, every week, every couple weeks, we read that somewhere in this country, some innocent person is getting out of prison because, for one reason or another, he or she was falsely accused. This is the case, right here in Tacoma, where a person is falsely accused, and we believe the evidence will show just what we are talking about.

In the end, of course, Judge Burgess presides over the courtroom, but again, in every criminal case in this country, it is the jury that is the final judge about what happened, what didn't happen, if there's a doubt as to what happened, if there's a reasonable doubt as to what happened.

Of course, you are asked to bring your every day lives, your common sense, your life experience. Please don't leave them at the door. That's why we don't have machines instead of computers making judgments. It's about you; it's about

what you bring here, everything. Each of us has a different experience. Please bring it. Please don't be influenced by, particularly, the last few words Mr. Friedman spoke. He talked about Disneyland and the Statue of Liberty. Why would he say such a thing? This has nothing to do with Disneyland or the Statue of Liberty or any other public targets like that. That's not what this is about.

This is about a bunch of fools, not including Ms. Waters, who decided that it was a good thing to do, to burn down buildings. Two of those fools -- one is Lacey Phillabaum, and another is Jennifer Kolar, and there are others. Stan Meyerhoff is another one. That's a name you will hear in this case. They did these things. They planned these things. They decided they would target certain buildings, certain facilities. They planned it; they talked about it at these meetings that Mr. Friedman has mentioned. They built devices; they recruited people. They did everything they could to accomplish this criminal activity.

You heard Mr. Friedman say Briana Waters was not at any of these meetings. Of course she wasn't. She wasn't part of this. Even though Mr. Friedman told you, no less than 26 times -- he talked about Briana Waters and her coconspirators or her coactors, and used different words. He used the word "they" -- I am not exaggerating -- at least 150 times in the short time that he spoke to you. He talked about what "they"

did. This is about what, if anything, Ms. Waters did. That's what this case is about. There's no dispute that there were these arsons. There's no dispute that the University of Washington Center for Urban Horticulture was burned down, and of course was destroyed. A foolish act, a wrong act, a criminal act in every conceivable way. No question about it.

We know two people who did that. One is Lacey Phillabaum and another is Jennifer Kolar. They are going to testify before you, and you have a right to consider what kind of people are these. What are they doing and why are they here testifying?

Well, as Mr. Friedman pointed out, each of them was facing at least 35 years in prison. I mean at least. That's a mandatory minimum. You will find out that they knew that if they didn't cooperate, they had a serious risk of going to prison for at least the mandatory minimum. No matter how nice the judge might be, had to be sentenced to 35 years in prison. That's what the crime of arson and the use of a destructive device carries if a person is convicted, and these women knew that. Definitely I will get back to them in a while.

Ms. Waters is innocent, not because of some technicality; she's innocent because she was not involved with this group of people in any arson or any attempts to commit arson or any discussions of arson. That's not what happened. You will hear about who she is, what she has done with her life, and

what she does do with her life.

Let's talk about the burden of proof always being on the government. That was not always true on this continent. You may recall, I guess in grade school and high school, the Salem witch hunts; people were accused of being witches, and they had to prove that they weren't witches.

Well, the founders of the Constitution had a different idea. They made it clear, eventually as the Supreme Court decided cases, that it was always the prosecution who had the burden of proving the accusations. I think that's a good change.

Mr. Friedman talked about a number of times, what do these groups do? What did this group do? The question is, what, if anything -- if anything -- did Ms. Waters do?

Ms. Waters, you will find, the evidence will show, that she was not involved in the Earth Liberation Front. That she was involved, as Mr. Friedman pointed out, in a campus organization, Evergreen Animal Rights Network. She was also involved in something called Earth First.

What you will find from the evidence is when she was at Evergreen, she chose as a project -- she was in communications -- she chose as a project, a particular project documenting a wonderful, wonderful event.

There's a small town in the cascades called Randle -- about 300 people. The timber company that owned the property

above Randle wanted to clear-cut it, wanted to cut down the trees. Everybody knows, scientifically, you cut down the trees; floods. Randle was slated to die.

And people from Earth First, at the Earth Liberation

Front, people from Earth First, the hippies, the tree huggers, the people who want to save the earth, got together with these 300 absolutely stray Americans from this tiny town of Randle. And at first they were, you know, they were a little different from each other, but within weeks, not only were the people from Randle in support of the assistance they were getting from these Earth First people, the tree huggers, but before long, these people from Randle, middle aged men and women, were up in the trees with them, trying to prevent the cutting down of these trees.

Ms. Waters, while she was at Evergreen, she chose as her project to document that struggle. What did that mean? She wrote and produced and directed and scripted a one-hour documentary, that I hope the judge lets you see. It's called "Watch," W-a-t-c-h, and it's called Watch because the mountain is Watch Mountain.

You will hopefully see the film, but at least you will hear about it. That's how she was spending her time, from about 1999 -- the editing was finished in around April of 2001, about a month before Lacey Phillabaum, Jennifer Kolar, and their associates burned down the building at the

University of Washington.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ms. Waters was working day and night filming, editing, scripting, getting the music, doing everything you do to put together a magnificent one-hour documentary. That's what she was doing. And from that moment on, after it was finally, as they say, in the can, or halfway in the can, it was a matter of getting it distributed. She was spending her time, that's what she was doing with her time. She wasn't burning buildings, she wasn't going to what they call incubator meetings or what they cutely called book club meetings. She wasn't at any of those meetings. She wasn't a planner. She wasn't involved with the Earth Liberation Front. She was busy with her film and with her life.

She's a musician. She plays the violin. She's played the violin since childhood. She's in occasional bands, which she does now. First it was Irish fiddle she was interested in and bluegrass, and mostly now Balkan music. That is her love. That has always been her love, and that's what else she was doing. Plus she was spending her time with her friends and family -- her boyfriend, I should say, at Evergreen.

Today she does that. She's with her partner, John, who is the father of their three-year-old child, Calliope, who just turned three. Calliope is a musical name, obviously.

That is what she was doing with her time when Lacey
Phillabaum, Jennifer Kolar, Stan Meyerhoff, Avalon, Chelsea

Gerlach, and a whole bunch of other people were out there planning and burning down buildings, not Briana Waters.

Briana Waters, during the time she was involved in the events at Randle, the filming and production of Watch, they were also doing other things, her group of people on campus. They were working with longshoremen in Tacoma to create a bond so that there would be no class differences. She's a working class person. She grew up in Pennsylvania in a working family. Her mom; she has brothers. She very much understands the needs of working people. That's who she is. That's where she comes from. That's what she is.

They also work, she did in her group at Evergreen, worked with unions, in solidarity with them so that they could accomplish what they had to accomplish. This is not warfare between loggers and tree huggers. This is her efforts to achieve unity in the struggle against the forces that are not so good when it comes to environmental work.

That's her work, that's her life, and that was her mission. She is not an arsonist. She has pleaded not guilty. She has denied any guilt. She has pleaded not guilty to this unlike, literally, every other person involved in these events.

I will explain that most of the people who were accused were accused in an indictment that was handed down in Eugene, Oregon. It was handed down December 7 of 2005, a little over

two years ago.

Everybody in that case, about a dozen people, not counting a couple people who are fugitives -- and here, Lacey

Phillabaum and Jennifer Kolar -- everybody else, everybody has pleaded guilty. And they pleaded guilty because they are quilty.

Ms. Waters has pleaded not guilty because she is not guilty and she wants a trial. She doesn't want a trial; she wants this case to get dismissed. I will talk in a while about why this case should have been dismissed two years ago. But she's not pleaded guilty.

Some of the evidence besides Kolar and Phillabaum that

Mr. Friedman has talked about is the worst kind of innuendo.

Consider, if they searched my house today, and I am not really a scholar, but I can read, I do read, and you will find books about capitalism. You will find books about free enterprise.

You will find books about Communism. Does that mean if I have a book about Communism, I am a Communist? Does that mean if I refer a book or an article to someone, or 15 articles to someone, that means I am promoting what's in those articles?

We will get back to that, on the evidence. We will talk

So please, I ask you to be very cautious and very circumspect and don't be pushed. Don't be pushed. Don't let them treat you as if you don't understand what innuendo is.

about that as the evidence comes in.

Don't let them treat you, don't let them denigrate you. Don't let them tell you terrorism.

Disneyland. Disneyland. Come on, it's not about
Disneyland. It's to scare you. Don't be scared. Be brave.
That's what the jury experience is about, is courage and using your own independent judgment and not being pushed by anything except the evidence and your common sense and your life experience. That's what it's about.

I urge you, I pray to you that that is what you do.

Let's talk about the events from around 1996 to 2001. There were in fact about, something like 17 different arsons, or approximately -- maybe 15, maybe 18 -- for which the Earth Liberation Front took credit, if credit is the word. Every one of those arsons was dangerous. It was dangerous to the people surrounding those buildings. It was dangerous to the people who occupied those buildings. It was dangerous to the firefighters who came to fight it. There's always a risk, and terrible things happen, as we know, when firefighters come in, unpredictable things. It was wrong for every reason. There's no dispute about that.

Again, we know that Jennifer Kolar sat in meetings, went to these five so-called book club meetings, or incubator meetings. She went, she planned, she taught people how to encrypt their messages. She was involved in building these incendiary devices. She was involved in picking targets, and

so was Lacey Phillabaum. That's who they are.

They were involved -- and Mr. Friedman described it as reconnaissance of targets, selecting targets, reconnaissance of targets -- Lacey Phillabaum, Jennifer Kolar, Stan Meyerhoff.

By the way, Stan Meyerhoff is a name we have now mentioned. One thing you want to know about Stan Meyerhoff, he's the fiancé of Lacey Phillabaum.

Another thing you want to know about Stan Meyerhoff is that in the Oregon case that he was arrested, as were many others, on December 7, two years ago, that he became a cooperating witness within two hours. He was arrested actually in the state of Virginia. He started naming names within two hours. One of the names he named was his own fiancée -- not that day, but at some point later; they talked to him many times -- he named Lacey Phillabaum, and he named many others. His fiancée.

He was not at all reluctant to name names, because he, too, was facing essentially the rest of his life in prison.

Now, the mandatory 35 years in prison, that's if you do one arson. If you do two or more, you are facing life in prison, and that's what he was facing. In fact, that's what Jennifer Kolar is facing, life in prison.

Phillabaum, who's admitted to only one arson, she's only facing the next 35 years in prison, essentially her whole

life. But she made a deal, so she's not facing that.

Mr. Friedman suggested what each of those two women is facing. But in fact -- it's important to know this -- Lacey Phillabaum is facing a sentence where the maximum range between the best she can do is three years, the worst she will do is five years; and it will be up to, in fact, Judge Burgess, before whom both women pleaded guilty, where in that range the sentence will be.

It is very much in their interest to please the people sitting at this prosecution table so that they will say to Judge Burgess, when sentence comes, we think she deserves the lower end of that sentence.

The same issue -- the numbers are different -- Kolar, she is facing a minimum sentence of five years, a maximum sentence of seven years; exactly the same consideration. Both women hope, of course, that the sentence will be at the lower end of that range, and they have a very high incentive to make sure that they please Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Friedman -- that's when they testify.

I want to talk about Mr. Meyerhoff. Mr. Meyerhoff, in the Oregon case where he pleaded guilty, he got the highest sentence of all the people involved. The reason he got the highest sentence is because he was involved in virtually everything. He was a planner, he was a theoretician, he built bombs --

1 MR. FRI EDMAN: Objection, Your Honor. This is 2 i rrel evant. Mr. Meyerhoff isn't on our witness list or on the 3 defense witness list. He's not going to be a witness in this 4 case. 5 MR. BLOOM: If he needs to be, we will put him on our 6 witness list. 7 But when Mr. Meyerhoff --8 THE COURT: Confine the argument if you will --9 MR. BLOOM: I'm sorry? Confine the argument to what the jury is 10 THE COURT: 11 going to see. 12 MR. BLOOM: I will. I didn't object at all --13 THE COURT: I understand. Go ahead. 14 MR. BLOOM: The evidence will show that Mr. Meyerhoff 15 was involved in everything. He was involved in this double 16 He was involved in planning. He was involved in whammy. 17 reconning it, doing reconnaissance. He was involved in 18 constructing the incendiary devices. He was involved in every 19 aspect of the so-called double whammy. That's the May 21st 20 arson at the University of Washington that took place at the 21 same time as an arson that took place at what's called the 22 Jefferson Poplar Farm in Oregon. They happened at about the 23 same time, and Mr. Friedman correctly stated that that was 24 done with the intent of showing strength from the people who

in fact were involved with the Earth Liberation Front.

25

He was arrested, as I mentioned, in Virginia on December 7 of '05, and he started naming names. It was to his benefit to give names, because then he could show he was cooperating. It was not to his benefit if he was shown a picture and said, no, that person was not involved. That didn't help him. It didn't necessarily hurt him, but it didn't help him.

He's a person who was not in any way reluctant to give names. And I remind you, one of the names he gave was his own fiancée.

A very important date in this investigation was St. Patrick's day --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Objection. First, he's not on the witness list. If they do call him --

THE COURT: Counsel, I understand. Let's see if we can get through this without a lot of interruption, because if it opens the door to something, then I will discuss it.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. BLOOM: On March 17 of '06, Mr. Meyerhoff was questioned by FBI agents and others as part of his cooperation. On that day, he was shown pictures. One of the pictures they showed him -- that's one of the pictures they showed him.

Mr. Meyerhoff looked at that picture, and he said to the questioners, when they asked him, "Does this person look familiar?" and what he said is, "This person in this picture

looks familiar, and she was not involved, "meaning not involved in any arson. This is not just some guy. This is Meyerhoff, who was involved in everything, said that she was not involved.

Could you stand up a moment, please?

I ask you to look at Ms. Waters and look at that picture. And if you are looking at that picture and you say that woman in that picture was not involved, you are meaning that woman was not involved. Mr. Meyerhoff, the heavyweight, Mr. Big, Mr. Planner, Mr. Doer, Mr. Know It Everything said she's not involved.

This case should have ended as to Briana Waters on March 17, in the year 2006, two years ago, because they knew from a person who is giving names, cooperating, doing everything he could to give all the names he could, including his fiancée, he said no, this woman is not involved.

This case couldn't end against Briana Waters because -and this is where your common sense and your life experience
should be brought to bear -- this administration, Attorney
General Gonzalez, President Bush, they couldn't give up
because this was their centerpiece, domestic terrorism. They
are not dismissing any cases.

They should have dismissed it as to Briana Waters. That should have been the end of the investigation as to Briana Waters. Meyerhoff said no.

How did they get her name in the picture? Mr. Friedman is correct, her name came up. And how did it first come up?

Well, it came up first with Jennifer Kolar. I will get back to that in a little while.

If I may suggest to you, what Mr. Meyerhoff said to the investigators, a man to whom it was important to give names and say yes, this person was involved; yes, this person was involved. He looked at her picture. The picture looks more like her than she looks like her. That's a person who wasn't involved, and he said so.

Now, he said a number of other things during his interviews. He described a blond woman from Olympia. But as to that woman, he said that's a woman, and I am referring to, not in connection with the University of Washington arson, there was another arson that Mr. Friedman didn't mention. There was an arson after this, at a rural place in California where Mr. Meyerhoff was involved. And he said there was a blond woman from Olympia who was involved; that that woman was a person who was originally from California. That was a woman who had no connection to another person involved in that, a guy named Joe Dibee, a member of the ELF, who is a fugitive now. He was clearly describing a different person.

So you may hear: Well, if Meyerhoff said this, not involved, he said other things that you should hear about. You should hear it all. No question. Use your judgment.

1 2

5 6

7

4

8 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

20

21

19

22 23

24

25

And you will find that the people who have admitted in this group, who have pleaded guilty to involvement in these events, they will make clear that no matter what Meyerhoff suggests or hints about Susanville, those people who participated in the Susanville event, they don't recognize Briana Waters.

In fact, the Susanville event was an event where the people who were involved camped out for two-and-a-half days. It wasn't like 40 people; it was eight or ten people. these two people, Tubbs and Thurston, they don't recognize Briana Waters because she wasn't there.

So no matter what more innuendo you may hear, and I don't know how they are going to put it in -- they are going to try -- she's not accused of being involved in the Susanville She's not indicted for it; she never has been.

In fact, in the conspiracy count in this indictment, they list 25 overt acts committed by various members of the alleged conspiracy. The one -- one -- in which Briana Waters is named is the University of Washington arson. That other arson, Susanville, is mentioned. She is not mentioned in that.

So please be wary as you hear the evidence of more innuendo that she was involved in another arson. She was not involved in any arson.

Let's talk about her connection to Mr. Rodgers, Avalon. Mr. Friedman told you a number of times how they went to great lengths and took great pain not to leave trails. Here's a woman who, in her own name, has been asked by Mr. Rodgers to rent them a telephone -- not rent; to buy them a telephone, I should say, a cell phone -- and she does that and she pays the bill.

Now, how is that going to great lengths if she was involved? Of course not. Of course it had nothing to do with -- anything to do with arson or Earth Liberation Front. The evidence will show he asked her, because he was having credit problems, if she would get a phone for him.

Now, he may have misled her. It may have been indeed on his mind that he wanted to hide his identity, but he asked her, the relationship he had with her, a woman who was in the environmental, above ground, totally legitimate, totally honest, totally lawful, activities at Evergreen: Briana, do me a favor. I can't get a cell phone, I need one. Would you -- I'll pay you for it. Would you rent me, buy me a cell phone? And she did. And to suggest that that group that's protecting itself and going to great lengths to not make connections, that's just ridiculous, that she would do that knowing -- he would do that, knowing the potential downside of that.

That's not what happened. That's not why it happened. So don't let that innuendo, don't let them throw that at you.

Don't let them, again, treat you as though you don't

understand and can't reason through it. It's really simple.

She would never have, and he would never have asked her to buy a phone in her name if she were in any way connected to these ELF activities. It just wouldn't happen.

There will be a bunch of testimony about the nature of the devices that were used, whether or not they were incendiary devices, incendiary bombs. Technical matters like that,

Mr. Fox will be dealing with that. I would just ask you, we do have to deal with that because, as you have already heard, the accusation regarding the use of a destructive device is the one that Lacey Phillabaum and Jennifer Kolar had to deal with, where they were facing that gigantic mandatory minimum sentence, and that's what they were concerned about. So we do have to deal with that. But that's not what this is about. Whatever the device was, whether it was an atomic bomb or a match, or anywhere in between, Ms. Waters had nothing to do with it. She wasn't there.

So we will talk about it, but that's not our focus. Our focus is that she didn't do it; she wasn't there.

Mr. Friedman is correct that these arsons, after they took place between 1996 and 2001, it was very frustrating for law enforcement. They really did not make headway until they got hold of this guy Jake Ferguson and he agreed to become an informant and he admitted his role. He's been sentenced, I believe, or at least he's been promised a sentence of

probation. Despite his involvement in a number of arsons, he is the first cooperating witness, got himself quite a break.

He will not have to do any time in jail or prison.

And what did he do? Well, when he agreed to become a cooperating witness, one of the things he did was he wore a wire, a transmitting device, so that he could have conversation with other of his coconspirators.

By the way, he didn't know of Briana Waters or hear of Briana Waters. He had no idea of who she is. No role whatsoever.

But why did he wear a wire? Why did they want -- why does law enforcement want there to be a record of what was said? Well, because it's very important to be able to prove to a jury who said what. There will be witnesses: I said this, he said that, she said that. That is of some importance; particularly if there are contemporaneous notes, that's important. But the best evidence of what was said would be a tape recording.

Now, when the FBI spoke to Jennifer Kolar and they spoke to Lacey Phillabaum, you will find that they had the option of asking a supervisor and the FBI if they could tape-record the interview. They chose not to exercise that option.

If they had that option, if we had a tape recording of what Jennifer Kolar said and the way she said it -- the first interview, for example, December 16 of '05, about a week after

everybody else got arrested, you would hear for yourself just 1 2 what she said. You wouldn't have to rely upon her memory. You wouldn't have to rely upon the memory of Mr. Halla, Mr. Friedman, or Agent Torres -- I am sorry, Agent Halla. 4 You 5 would hear the tape recording. But we don't have a tape recording because Mr. Friedman and the FBI decided they were 6 7 not going to tape-record what Jennifer Kolar said. 8 Remember, the burden of proof is on the government. would go a long way to prove what was said and whether she was 10 vague or specific about naming people who did not include 11 Briana Waters. 12 In fact, I will get back to it, she named herself, Avalon, 13 Capitol Hill Girl, Capitol Hill Girl's punk boyfriend, as she 14 described him, and a guy named Crazy Dan. That's who she said 15 on December 16, the first interview as a cooperating witness, 16 facing life in prison unless her deal were accepted, that's 17 who she named as the perpetrators of this crime at the 18 University of Washington. That's who she named, not Briana 19 Briana Waters, as Meyerhoff has said, is not involved Waters. 20 in these arsons. 21 Excuse me for raising my voice, but what is happening here 22 is wrong. It is an outrage. She should not be here. 23 I have spoken a little bit about who Briana Waters is. 24 When she was in high school in Pennsylvania, even earlier

actually, she began to play the violin, got interested in

25

Irish fiddle and then expanded it. She teaches violin.

That's how she makes a very meager living where she lives now, in Oakland, California, with her partner and her child.

She plays in small bands. I am not talking about rock bands. She plays in what are called Balkan bands, and they play in very small venues for just a few dollars, and she doesn't do it very often. That's how she makes a living, and John works as a carpenter.

You will learn from the evidence in this case what kind of family they are and who they are, what kind of people they are.

She went to college in Ohio, a small school, and then she visited out this way and she wound up in Olympia, looking at Evergreen; and as many people do, she fell in love with Evergreen and she decided to transfer there. She could do her music; she could be in the environment. And that's what she did, she went to Evergreen. And when she was there, she got involved in environmental activities, a person who is wanting to save the water and the air and the trees and our environment which we live and breathe and drink the water. That's who she is. She is not an arsonist. She is not a violent person. Quite the opposite. She's simply not that person.

She got involved in the project to film and document the struggle at Watch Mountain. And that, as you heard -- I won't

repeat it -- that's how she spent her time. I hope you will hear from somebody, from one of the people who is one of the residents of Randle about how she spent her time and what those events were about.

As I say, we will try to offer that documentary into evidence. It's up to Judge Burgess as to whether or not you will see it. I surely hope you see it. I think it will be very enlightening and will tell you not only how she was spending her time but what kind of person she was then and is now.

While she was doing that, the Earth Liberation Front people, they, as Mr. Friedman said -- I am not exaggerating; you heard it, maybe about 150 times, he said "they" did this, "they" did that. "They," "they," "they," "they." We're talking about her. What did she do?

It's appropriate for Mr. Friedman to talk about "they," because these events were bad events. They were wrong. They were dangerous. They were criminal. But again, the focus is what, if anything, did she do?

One of the things I haven't mentioned yet is that the people in the Earth Liberation Front movement, they all had nicknames. For example, really kind of aliases. Jennifer Kolar was known as Diver, D-I-V-E-R. Lacey Phillabaum was known as Reba. Stan Meyerhoff was known as Country Boy.

Ms. Waters was known as Briana or Bri. She had no code name. She had no alias. She's not part of the ELF.

They had meetings. At one of the meetings, where of course she was not present, they had what they called an ailment list; that each person took -- more like a joke -- an ailment name. Like one was known as, as cholera -- I'm making these up. But they all had like kind of joke names, as code names. Ms. Waters didn't have any such name. She lived by her name openly. She rented her house. She had a boyfriend.

You know, you'll find in the end that when they got
Ms. Waters' name, they investigated her, as Mr. Friedman has
indicated. They investigated her right and left. Here's what
they got about Ms. Waters -- no incriminating evidence:

They got her phone records. They got her bank records. They got her mother's phone records and bank records. They got her grandparents' information. They got her credit card information. They got Justin Solondz's information. Everything.

They got their information from Evergreen college. They seized all this material from Justin Solondz's house. Nothing incriminating her. Nothing.

They got -- when they arrested Mr. Rodgers, Avalon,

December 7 in Arizona -- they got thousands and thousands and
thousands of pages of documents. There's one mention of
Briana Waters, and it's a mention in some list of resources

for environmental activities. Her film was mentioned, Watch. It doesn't talk about Briana Waters in the ELF. It only mentioned in, like hard drive after hard drive, in everybody's hard drive, what did they find? Nothing incriminating about her.

They went to CitiBank, which she had an account. Nothing. They went to Experian. Thank God -- without having to do anything but make a phone call or send a letter to Evergreen -- they got all her records, her exams, her test scores, everything. What she had written, her reports, what the professors had to say about her -- everything.

They went to Morgan Chase, which she had a bank account or a credit card. They went to Bank One where she had a credit card, or it was the same credit card. And they went to Wachovia where she had the same credit card.

They got her spending records. They got her shopping records. They got her father's records. They got her brother's records. They went to her recently, they went to her own website, and what do they have? They have what they have told you so far. They have innuendo, and a couple things -- and we will deal with each of these things as they come up. Please, before you accept -- this thing about the car and the cousin is extraordinary.

For starters, after they got Ms. Waters' name, at the end of '05 or the beginning of '06, they wound up, after they

spoke to both Kolar and Phillabaum, they wound up on February 24 of '06, about eight weeks after this original interview with Kolar -- and Agent Halla was one of the people who went where Briana Waters was living in Berkeley at the time. He was very polite to her; he wasn't abusive at all. He wanted her to get a lawyer and cooperate. And she got a lawyer, but she had nothing to cooperate about. You will learn I was that lawyer.

Let me hold the rest of that, I want to get back into that in a moment. Let me regress.

When they asked her to cooperate, to get a lawyer -- and that's what they do. That's the way they do it. It's not inappropriate; it's the way the FBI operates. They get names, they follow those names, they follow those leads. In that regard, Agent Halla, the case agent, was doing what he was supposed to do.

There came a time soon after I was retained that I was in touch with Mr. Friedman. Something happened that I will talk about in a little while with regard to conversations that were had between the prosecution and Ms. Waters through me. I want to put that -- I want to keep that in context. I just want to alert you to that, and I will get back to that.

What happened after that was Ms. Waters spoke to me. suggested -- and she did -- that she get in touch with her friends and her relatives.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Objection, Your Honor, unless she wishes to waive all of her attorney/client privilege.

MR. BLOOM: You are right, I will withdraw it. I will say it another way.

Soon after I was retained, Ms. Waters contacted a number of people, her friends and her family, and said to them: I am innocent, I haven't done anything. If the FBI comes around to interview you, just tell them the truth. I am innocent, and tell them the truth.

And one of the people to whom she said that was her cousin who lived up in Olympia, Rob Corrina, and Rob's wife, Kara, Kara Larson. That's what Ms. Waters said to Rob Corrina, "I am innocent. Don't worry about it. Tell the truth."

Well, when the FBI first came around and heard this, Mr. Friedman, when they first came around to Rob Corrina and they said in effect, we want to talk to you about Briana Waters, he said, "Who? I don't even know any Briana Waters." He lied to them. For whatever his reasons, this guy decided he was going to lie to them.

After he'd been told by or suggested by Ms. Waters, tell them the truth, I have nothing to hide, tell them the truth, he lied. And he put himself in a pickle, because the pickle is -- and the name Martha Stewart may ring a bell. Martha Stewart got convicted for the crime of making a false statement to a federal law enforcement official.

Now, there came a time when Mr. Corrina got himself a lawyer, and there can be no doubt that that lawyer said to him and Kara Larson, his wife, you are already in trouble. You've lied to federal officers. So if you want to save yourself, you should listen to what they have to say and use your judgment.

I don't know what was said between them, but certainly he was aware of the fact that he was already in trouble for lying. Why? He said he didn't even know Briana Waters, his cousin.

So what happened from him, I am not going to go into any detail now, but what he had to say and what he has to say when Mr. Friedman presents it to you -- let me put it this way, you did not get a complete picture from what Mr. Friedman told you about Mr. Corrina and Kara Larson. When they testify, I hope you'll get a more complete picture of what happened between them and who this car was for and what this car was about.

Let's talk about the car for a minute.

It appears from what Mr. Friedman tells you that this incident, the arson, took place at, say, 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning, on a Monday morning/a late Sunday night. It appears to be Mr. Larson is saying -- I am sorry, Mr. Corrina is saying that that Sunday, at some point, Briana Waters came to him and said, can I use the car you've rented? Now, isn't that a little bit shaky and risky? What if they were out

taking a drive? What if they were out eating? What if they weren't around all day? Then the arsonist, if she was involved in it, wouldn't have a car, if that's really what happened.

That's not what happened. It's ridiculous. In fact, some of the writings of Mr. Rodgers, of Avalon, made clear that when you are planning something like this, you have the car set, all established for at least 36 hours. You don't want to take a chance that the car that somebody is supposed to arrange isn't going to be available. It's ridiculous.

I don't want to go into too much detail about the Corrina and the Larson testimony, but you will hear it. Please keep an open mind, listen beyond the direct examination, listen to the cross-examination, and I think you will understand what he has to say is not truthful, not reliable, doesn't meet the burden and the standard as required for proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Let's talk about -- Ms. Waters comes from a working class family. You are going to find that Lacey Phillabaum and Jennifer Kolar did not come from working class families. You are going to find that they are spoiled kids who are accustomed to a rather up-scale lifestyle, who didn't want to give up their up-scale life-styles.

Lacey Phillabaum's parents, you will find, in Spokane, are both lawyers, partners in a law firm. She, herself,

Phillabaum, describes her family as upper middle class.

Kolar -- and by the way, more about Lacey Phillabaum, a very smart person, and I think you will find her to be a physically attractive person. She's not only smart -- I think she may have graduated from college with some honors -- but she was a very skillful and skilled debater.

So this is not one of those situations where this bully lawyer is going to be questioning her and she doesn't know what's up. She's very smart, and she will clearly -- she's not a person at a disadvantage when she's being asked questions.

Jennifer Kolar is also very smart. She has a degree from the University of Colorado, I believe, in very advanced astrophysics type major, I can't be specific. She also has a master's degree. And at the time of these events, she was a Ph.D. candidate; a really smart person.

And if she comes in and takes the position that when she spoke to them, law enforcement, that very first time, that very important date, December 16 of '05, a critical date, that she just forgot who was involved in the arson. This Ph.D. candidate forgot who was involved in the arson? We are not talking about who did she have dinner with. We are talking about with whom did she plan an arson, have meetings, go to an arson, have dinner just before, go to the arson, do things. We are talking about, according to them, five people -- four

people and herself -- and she just remembered two weeks, three weeks after she lied to them, or did she lie to them on December 16th? Jennifer Kolar is not a stupid person. She's a smart person, and she's a schemer.

Now, here's the other thing you are going to hear about Jennifer Kolar. This is quite astonishing. To this day, to this day she has never named Lacey Phillabaum as one of the people who committed the arson with her. You know, unless that changed yesterday, but to this day she has never named Lacey Phillabaum, who has pleaded guilty to being one of the people who committed the crime. Jennifer Kolar, for whatever her reasons, has not named her, Lacey Phillabaum. Both of them, you may recall, are people from Spokane. They went to the same high school.

Now, I ask you to consider when you are listening to

Jennifer Kolar and evaluating whether or not she's a person

upon whose word you can rely, the fact is she has never said

that one of the other four people with her was Lacey

Phillabaum. What are we talking about? We are talking about

Alice In Wonderland here. This is a woman who they are

relying upon, who says Lacey Phillabaum, she said, I don't

remember a role for Lacey in that arson. She said that at one

point to the investigators. Come on. Common sense, human

experience.

So all I ask you, don't make a judgment now, but when you

are listening, when you first listen to the first words out of her mouth, think about, this is a person who says Lacey

Phillabaum is not one of the perpetrators, or I don't remember her being one of the perpetrators.

More about Jennifer Kolar. She's a woman who has done very well for herself. She has personal property and personal -- and a lifestyle, I should say, that she wants to protect. She doesn't want to go to prison.

What is it she wants to protect? Well, she owns a yacht, and she's a member of a yacht club in Seattle, the Corinthian Yacht Club in Seattle. And she races the yacht, and it's a valuable piece of property this yacht that she owns.

She's a person who has so much at stake that we know she's lied. We know she's lying today about Lacey Phillabaum. We know that. They are going to claim that she was lying or mistaken when she first spoke to them on December 16; that she was lying when she named herself and the four other people who were involved: Capitol Hill Girl, Capitol Hill Girl's boyfriend, William Rodgers, and Crazy Dan, and herself. Those are the people she said. Is that true or is that not true? Is that a person you want to rely upon, when she now says Briana Waters? No, it isn't a person, I submit to you, that you want to rely upon.

Jennifer Kolar, again, she was involved in the Cavel West arson that Mr. Friedman mentioned. And she was involved in

the planning of it and the execution of it. And when she got through with that, she did another one, something called the Wray -- W-r-a-y -- Wray Gun, an attempted arson. I may have them switched in order. But after she did one arson, she went right back and she did another one. And then after she was through with those two, she did another one, this one. And she's going to come in and say, oh, I'm sorry, I was wrong.

What kind of person does that? What kind of person are you listening to? What kind of person are they relying upon to convict Briana Waters, who had nothing to do with it?

Stan Meyerhoff said not involved, and he knew, he knows. He's a cooperating witness. If they want to call him, they can call him. They have the burden of proof. If they want to prove anything I have said here is not true, that he didn't say not involved, put him on the witness stand. Put him on the witness stand and let him say, I didn't say that. Let him say, oh, I couldn't recognize that picture. That picture, that's her picture. You see that. He saw that. He looked at it, and said not involved.

Going back to the first cooperating witness, Jake

Ferguson, who wore the wire. His wearing a wire is what put a couple of the other people involved in the Earth Liberation

Front, particularly Meyerhoff and a couple of others, his wiring is what put them in the situation where they really had no choice. They had to cooperate, otherwise go to prison

forever. That's the way it works, if they have good evidence. As to them, they have good evidence; they have the tape evidence, they have tape recordings of Meyerhoff admitting to these crimes.

They don't have that kind of evidence because there isn't any such evidence because Briana Waters did not commit these crimes. They don't even have Kolar on tape telling them what she told them at her various interviews, and there were a lot of interviews. They don't have Phillabaum on tape so you can hear just what she's saying and how she said it.

Let me talk about the interview of Jennifer Kolar on December 16. One of the things that's important about that interview is that it was about four-and-a-half years after the incident, the University of Washington arson. And you can imagine when they, the prosecutors, heard from Jennifer Kolar's lawyer -- his name is Michael Martin -- that she wanted to come in and speak to them, how excited they must have been. This is the first person, after a four-and-a-half year investigation, who's going to come in and who's going to tell them what happened, how the crime happened and who did it.

Sitting there in Mr. Friedman's office, and she comes in with her lawyer, and they talk about a bunch of other things. They lead up to it, and eventually they get to the University of Washington. And now Ted Halla, who's working himself to

the bone -- no question about it, conscientious, trying to get this crime resolved and do his work -- he and Mr. Friedman and the other agent, Torres, they hear her -- that is Jennifer Kolar -- say what she has to say. And one of the things they did, this is one of the things they are required to do, is they took notes as to what she said.

I don't want to talk any more about the notes, I don't want to talk about the reports that were made from the notes. But understand, they didn't tape-record it, but they took notes. It's likely you will hear more about the notes during the trial.

You will hear that last August Ms. Kolar was interviewed by Mr. Bartlett, Assistant U.S. Attorney, in August, August 15, about six months ago, eight months ago, and she affirmed to him that on that fist interview, back in December of '05, that she did in fact definitively name herself, Rodgers, Capitol Hill Girl, Capitol Hill Girl's boyfriend, and Crazy Dan. She affirmed that that was her recollection. She wasn't vague about, oh, Capitol Hill Girl, I don't know. Those are the people she named in her first statement, which had been waited four-and-a-half years. That's what she said. She said that as recently as this August.

I have been asked to cut it short, I am going to trim some of what I am going to say.

You will hear from her lawyer that on January 5 of 2006 --

that's about three weeks after her initial statement, this

December 16 statement -- she named those people. On

January 5, Mr. Martin informed Mr. Friedman that Ms. Kolar had remembered that Briana Waters was involved and that she was involved as the lookout.

Well, on January 6, the very next day, the very next day, Jennifer Kolar is interviewed by Agent Halla and other people. And, of course, they are going to ask her about, well, your lawyer has told us that you remembered Briana Waters being involved. Of course they are going to ask her that. If they believed her, of course they would ask her about it.

But in fact, they did not ask her about it that very next day, January 6. In fact, the next time they interview her, about a week later, again they didn't ask her. And again, a couple of weeks later, they didn't ask her, was Briana Waters a lookout? Was Briana Waters involved in this arson?

In fact, Briana Waters' name came up in a totally innocent context. She didn't say at that time, yes, that's the Briana Waters I mean who was the lookout. Nobody said that. Nobody asked that. Nobody said why? Does that make any sense?

Now, we weren't there; Mr. Fox and Ms. Waters and I weren't there during these interactions with Mr. Martin, the I awyer, and Ms. Kolar. But we do know that she wasn't asked about it and she didn't mention Briana Waters at any interview as being involved in this until March, weeks and weeks and

weeks later, after Lacey Phillabaum had spoken to law enforcement.

What is that about? Why do you think, if they had information on January 5 of 2006 that Briana Waters was involved, why wouldn't they ask her?

When you are hearing the evidence, ask yourself, and demand, demand to hear an answer to that question. You can't speak up, but in your own hearts ask, how did this happen that they didn't ask her about it in seven or eight interviews after they supposedly learned that? Not one question.

Let's talk about Lacey Phillabaum for a moment. She, too, was, as we said, facing 35 years.

How do they get a second witness, after they got Kolar apparently to say, to remember that Briana Waters was involved? How do you get -- how does a second person get involved? How does Phillabaum get involved?

Well, I can tell you this much. I mentioned to you that on February 24 of '06, Agent Halla went and he spoke to, as I say, in a respectful way, to Ms. Waters. They wanted her to cooperate, and she got a hold of me. And eventually some weeks later, they did something which tells you how they do it.

They did something called a reverse proffer. Now, usually a lawyer, let's say in a drug case, goes to the prosecutor and says, listen, my client will come and tell you who committed

this murder or who Mr. Big is in the drug business; makes a proffer to the prosecutor.

A reverse proffer is where they tell you what they think happened. And by telling you that, they tell you that's what we want to hear. We want you to tell us that.

That's exactly what they did with Briana Waters on the telephone. She was in my office, they were in Seattle, and they told us what their theory of the case was. The witnesses, they told us about Jennifer Kolar, they talked about Lacey Phillabaum, they talked about they think she rented a car. They told us, they told her, a potential witness, what it is they wanted to hear from her. That's the way they do it.

There's all kinds of subtle ways they do it. And I suggest to you that in some way that's how they got Lacey Phillabaum, desperate Lacey Phillabaum, to tell them, to repeat their theory, to regurgitate what they had indicated to her.

She will tell you, Lacey Phillabaum will, that she has told friends that she didn't, quote "betray" anyone. What does she mean by that? She means she told them what she thought they already knew. And how does she know that? Because in some way they made it clear to her what they, quote, "already knew." That's how you get a second person involved in that.

Please, just listen to all the facts, everything, about Lacey Phillabaum. Not just cross-examination, but other related matters.

There are many matters regarding the car.

By the way, when Jennifer Kolar was first interviewed on that very first day, she said that the vehicle that was used, it was either a car or a van. We haven't heard that yet. We've heard that it was a car.

Why would Jennifer Kolar say it may have been a van or it was a van?

Well, if we had a tape recording of what she said, we would know just what she said. We wouldn't have to rely on other people's testimony or her testimony. We would hear a tape recording. If she said van, then we would hear her say van.

You will hear about that car, and let me just say one thing. You will hear who used that car and what they used it for. You will hear about that. You will hear about why that car was rented. Quite different from what Mr. Friedman has told you.

Kolar said something else later on. On February 4 -- I am almost finished, Judge -- on February 4 of 2006, she told Agent Halla, she said, I don't remember Briana and Lacey being together.

Now, if that's true that they were not together, that's

the end. It's the other end of the case. If they weren't together, if Phillabaum is committing the crime and Kolar is there and Kolar doesn't see them together, that means Briana Waters could not have been there, was not there. That's what she told them.

You will find -- let me leave that for proof.

One more thing I wanted to mention. We have tried to speak to people in this case. We have tried to speak to Jennifer Kolar. Her lawyer says no; she says no. We've tried to speak to Lacey Phillabaum. She says no, she won't speak to us. We've tried to talk to the cousin, Rob Corrina, and his wife, Kara Larson. They won't speak to us. We've tried to speak to Agent Halla. He won't speak to us. We've tried to speak to Agent Torres. He won't speak to us.

This is what's called, in another context, the wall of silence. That's what we have met here. They can put all kinds of pressure on people, the government can, the prosecution can, to get people to talk to them. They have hanging over their heads 35 years in prison, and of course people talk to them.

We don't have any. We don't have that kind of power. We don't have that kind of influence. We can't make anybody talk to us. They can, and they do.

I just want to ask you to bring this thought with you.

When you hear this case and you hear the evidence and if you

have a reasonable doubt as to the credibility of the witnesses and the prosecution's case and if you say not guilty, everybody wins. Even they win because that's what this country is about. Before you can convict a person of a crime, especially a serious crime, you've got to be sure beyond a reasonable doubt that you are doing the right thing.

If you say no, the evidence is not here beyond a reasonable doubt, everybody wins.

I pray to you that you don't let an innocent person get convicted. You will find this is a wonderful human being, who is here because of the pressure that's been put on two people who are not people of principle. They have falsely named her in order to save themselves and to save their life-styles.

It's tragic. This whole thing is tragic, from the arsons on down to what these two women have sunk to.

If Ms. Waters looks tired and scared; it's because she is. It's been two years of this nightmare for something she didn't do. She's got a child to raise. She's got -- this isn't about sympathy. I am not saying vote not guilty because of sympathy. That's the way she looks. She is exhausted. Emotionally exhausted and physically exhausted. She's lucky to have Mr. Fox and myself to help her through this.

We ask you to please keep your minds open. This whole apparatus -- the courtroom, Judge, prosecutor, defense lawyers, jury selection, clerks -- it's overwhelming. One or

more of the jurors could say, well, if she's here she must 1 2 have done something. That's not America. If she did it and they prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, you have a duty. if they haven't proven it beyond a reasonable doubt, I pray 4 5 you will end this horrible, unreal nightmare for a person who 6 is innocent. 7 Thank you. 8 THE COURT: All right. Now, before we take any 9 testimony, I will give you your noon recess. As we indicated 10 and talked about, an hour to do that. 11 So I am going to give you ten minutes on the other side of 12 the hour, so I will have you back here ready to go about 1:15. 13 As you go about your business, always remember you are not 14 to talk about the case or research or let anybody else talk to 15 When you are back in the building, of course, report you.

(Jury not present.)

always. See you back here at 1:15.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right, you may be seated.

directly into the jury room. Leave your books on the chair as

I assume at 1:15 we will be ready with the first witness?

MR. BARTLETT: We will, Your Honor.

THE COURT: How I have requested we handle the witnesses, that's all been done and no issues to take up?

MR. BARTLETT: The only issue I would bring up, Your Honor, is prior to trial the defense had asked that we not

```
1
    bring up that Justin Solondz is a fugitive and that William
 2
    Rodgers killed himself. I assume by the opening that you now
    realize we are going to bring that up. He indicated in his
    opening that everybody else has pleaded guilty, and factually
 4
    that isn't correct, and we need to correct the record.
 5
 6
             MR. BLOOM:
                         No problem.
 7
             THE COURT:
                         All right.
8
             MR. BARTLETT:
                            Thank you.
9
             THE COURT: We are at recess.
                                             1: 15.
10
             THE CLERK: All rise. Court is in recess.
11
        (Luncheon recess.)
12
        (Jury not present.)
13
             THE COURT: All right, you may be seated.
        Ready for the first witness?
14
15
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                            We are, Your Honor.
16
             THE COURT:
                         Bring in the jury.
        (Jury present.)
17
18
             THE COURT: All right, you may be seated.
19
        Call your first witness.
20
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                            The Government calls John Comery.
21
             THE COURT: All right.
22
        Mr. Comery, let me have you come forward and raise your
23
    right hand.
24
        JOHN COMERY, called as a witness, duly sworn.
25
             THE COURT:
                         Come around and take the witness chair,
```

- 1 pl ease.
- 2 DI RECT EXAMINATION
- 3 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 4 **Q.** Good afternoon, Agent Comery.
- 5 **A.** Good afternoon.
- 6 Q. Could you tell us your whole name and spell your last name
- 7 | for the record?
- 8 A. John Comery, C-O-M-E-R-Y.
- 9 **Q.** Where do you work, Agent Comery?
- 10 **A.** I work as a senior Special Agent for the Bureau of Alcohol
- 11 | Firearms and Explosives in Portland, Oregon.
- 12 **Q.** As a Special Agent, what do you do?
- 13 **A.** I am a certified fire investigator for the agency, and I
- 14 investigate fires and explosions.
- 15 Q. Let me take you back a little bit. Where did you go to
- 16 college?
- 17 A. I have a Bachelor of Science degree in natural resources
- 18 from the University of Rhode Island.
- 19 Q. When did you finish there?
- 20 **A.** 1976.
- 21 Q. Did you go to any graduate school after that?
- 22 A. Yes, I did. I attended the University of Washington.
- 23 have a Master's of Science Degree in forestry, with a
- 24 specialization in fire science, which I received in 1981.
- 25 **Q.** Did you write a thesis on fire science?

- 1 **A.** Yes, I did.
- 2 **Q.** While in school, did you have any job; did you work
- 3 | anywhere while you were still in school?
- 4 A. Yes, I was a seasonal firefighter for the Forest Service.
- 5 | I started as an initial attack firefighter, and then worked as
- 6 a hotshot firefighter for many seasons.
- 7 Q. I have heard that term before. Can you tell us what a
- 8 | hotshot firefighter is?
- 9 A. It's a 24-hour crew that travels throughout the United
- 10 | States for suppressing large fires.
- 11 Q. For how long did you continue to work as a hotshot
- 12 | firefighter?
- 13 A. 1983, I went to the National Parks Service and Led a
- 14 | hotshot crew until July of 1987.
- 15 **Q.** In 1987, did you -- where did you go?
- 16 A. That's when I started with ATF.
- 17 Q. You've been a Special Agent since that time?
- 18 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 19 Q. Initially, did you start working as a fire investigator at
- 20 | ATF?
- 21 A. No, the first four years I did general investigations,
- 22 | which included doing firearms investigations, fire
- 23 investigations, and also explosives investigations.
- 24 **Q.** So when did you start working on arsons particularly?
- 25 **A.** I entered the certified fire investigator program in

- 1 | October 1991.
- 2 **Q.** Have you had any special training as a fire investigator?
- 3 **A.** Yes, I have. The ATF certification process is a two-year
- 4 training program.
- $5 \mid \mathbf{Q}$. Can you tell us what you did over the course of that two
- 6 years?
- 7 | A. During the two-year period, you investigate 100 fires
- 8 under the tutelage of an experienced fire investigator. You
- 9 attend seminars. You do self study. You also take -- we went
- 10 to the University of Maryland M.D. fire protection engineering
- 11 department and was taught fire dynamics.
- 12 Q. Is there any testing that occurs at the end of that
- 13 program?
- 14 A. Not with the ATF certification.
- 15 **Q.** Is there formal certification that occurs?
- 16 A. Yes, every year since my certification we have to
- 17 recertify, and that's based upon work experience, continuing
- 18 education, and other teaching and things like that.
- 19 Q. Have you been recertified every year since that year?
- 20 A. Yes, I have.
- 21 Q. Do you have any other certifications as a fire
- 22 | investigator?
- 23 A. Yes, from the International Association of Arson
- 24 | Investigators.
- 25 **Q.** What does it take to be certified by them?

- 1 **A.** They evaluate your work history, your training, your
- 2 education, and then you take a test. If you pass the test you
- 3 are certified.
- 4 Q. When were you first certified by that association?
- 5 **A.** 1991.
- 6 Q. Have you been recertified since that time?
- 7 **A.** That program requires a recertification every five years.
- 8 | My last recertification was August of 2007.
- 9 Q. You talked about a test a moment ago. Have you had any
- 10 other involvement with that test apart from taking the test?
- 11 A. Yes, I was assigned -- after my certification, I was a
- 12 | member of the LWLA, International Association of Arson
- 13 | Investigators, Certified Fire Investigation Committee, and I
- 14 participated in writing the test.
- 15 Q. You took a different version than the one you wrote, I
- 16 trust?
- 17 **A.** Yes.
- 18 Q. Are you familiar with something called the National Fire
- 19 | Protection Association?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 **Q.** Can you tell us what that is?
- 22 A. That's an association of engineers and people within fire
- 23 service that develop guides and codes that affect both
- 24 building construction, standards for firefighting and things
- 25 of that nature.

- 1 Q. You are on a technical committee of that association; is
- 2 | that correct?
- 3 **A.** That's correct. In 2001 I was appointed as a principal
- 4 member of the technical committee on fire investigation. That
- 5 committee is responsible for producing the document called NFP
- 6 A-921, Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigation.
- 7 \mathbf{Q} . Is that the leading guide on fire investigation?
- 8 **A.** Yes.
- 9 **Q.** Now, you are familiar with something called the National
- 10 Response Team, ATF's National Response Team?
- 11 **A.** Yes.
- 12 **Q.** Can you tell us what that is?
- 13 A. They have four national response teams divided into
- 14 regional areas. I was a member of the western National
- 15 Response Team for 11 years. And we responded to fires
- 16 throughout the United States, primarily west of the
- 17 Mississippi, although I did do a couple in the east.
- 18 Q. What determines whether the National Response Team
- 19 responds to a particular fire?
- 20 A. Typically, a local jurisdiction has had a large loss or a
- 21 complex fire and they need assistance, so the team responds
- 22 with a cadre of fire investigators, agents, fire protection
- 23 engineers, chemists and explosive specialists.
- 24 Q. You said you were on that team for 11 years?
- 25 **A.** Yes.

- 1 **Q.** From 1989 to 2000?
- 2 **A.** Yes.

5

- 3 MR. FRIEDMAN: The Government offers Agent Comery as 4 an expert in fire investigation.
 - MR. FOX: No objection.
- 6 THE COURT: You may ask questions.
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.
- 8 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 9 Q. Have you been involved in investigating a series of fires,
- 10 arsons that took place in Oregon and Washington between 1997
- 11 and 2001?
- 12 A. Yes, I have.
- 13 Q. Was there anything that caused you to link these fires in
- 14 | your investigation?
- 15 A. Yes. There were several things that linked them. The
- 16 nature of the targets, the nature of the devices that were
- 17 | found or the ignition methodology at the fires, and also the
- 18 | nature of how organizations claimed responsibility for setting
- 19 those fires.
- 20 Q. Let me walk you through a few of those points. First off,
- 21 anything about the geography of the fires that you found
- 22 si gni fi cant?
- 23 A. Many of them occurred in Oregon and Washington area.
- 24 Q. You mentioned the nature of the targets chosen. Can you
- 25 tell us what you mean by that?

- 1 **A.** Yes, they were either industries or Government agency
- 2 property that was of concern to animal liberation activists or
- 3 environmental liberation activists.
- 4 Q. You talked about the methodology of the fires; what did
- 5 you mean by that?
- 6 **A.** The majority of the fires involved multiple incendiary
- 7 devices. In many cases the devices were placed on the
- 8 exterior of the buildings. The fires occurred typically in
- 9 the early morning hours, and many times associated with
- 10 hol i days.
- 11 Q. Did you -- was there any pattern in terms of how many
- 12 | incendiary devices were used in each fire?
- 13 **A.** There were multiple incendiary devices which was highly
- 14 unusual, anywhere from two to five.
- 15 Q. You also talked about something that happened after the
- 16 | fi res?
- 17 A. Yes. There would be a communiqué, either from the Animal
- 18 | Liberation Front or from the Earth Liberation Front, or
- 19 sometimes both would claim responsibility for setting the
- 20 | fire.
- 21 Q. Agent Comery, I know you are not in the laboratory, but
- 22 did you examine devices or remnants of devices at a number of
- 23 these fires?
- 24 **A.** Yes.

- 1 A. The nature, the complexity of the design of the devices
- 2 was unusual.
- $\mathbf{S} \mid \mathbf{Q}$. Was there any consistency between the devices used at
- 4 different arsons?
- 5 | A. Yes. The devices typically had a large amount of
- 6 accelerant and liquid that was in plastic containers or
- 7 | buckets. They had a timing component that would then go to
- 8 power, which would power the igniter and cause the fire.
- 9 **o.** Were the devices used at each of these arsons identical?
- 10 **A.** No, they were not.
- 11 **Q.** We are going to walk through each of those in a minute.
- 12 | Was there anything about the pattern of them that you noticed
- 13 over time?
- 14 **A.** In general, the devices became more complex as the series
- 15 of arsons continued.
- 16 **Q.** Agent Comery, before we dive into some of the fires that
- 17 you investigated, can you explain to us in general terms how
- 18 you would usually conduct a fire investigation in this type of
- 19 case? How would you initially become involved?
- 20 | A. Typically a local jurisdiction or fire department or
- 21 police department would call for assistance. I would respond,
- 22 and working with a local or state agents or investigators that
- 23 were present, we would work the scene together.
- 24 This encompassed, when we arrived at the scene, gathering
- 25 information. We would gather witness information. We would

talk to firefighters to determine what they discovered upon their arrival and what actions they took to suppress the fire.

We would then try to understand the building construction, talk to the owners or occupants, look for building plans, things of the nature, or examine the remains. We also wanted to know the contents, what was in the building prior to the fire, what natural fuel was present. And then we would use our knowledge to examine the fire effects; look at the charring, the consumption of the timbers, things of that nature, and see if there were fire patterns. We'd look at the fire patterns, and what we were trying to do was go to the end of the fire back to origin.

So we would be retracing the fire spread from -- typically it's the least damaged to the most, but there were exceptions in that.

- **Q.** You mean the area where the fire starts is the most damaged?
- 18 A. That's a general rule. What would happen once you got to
 19 an area of origin, you would be looking for the mechanism that
 20 caused the ignition, what item ignited what fuel.
- **Q.** You talked about burn patterns. Is this what you mean by 22 burn patterns, how heavily different areas are burned, or is 23 there more to it?
- **A.** Sometimes when there's a fire, depending on where it 25 starts, there can be distinct patterns. If a fire starts on

the exterior of the building at the base, you can see the char coming right from the base of the building extending up the edge of the building.

A lot of times it will reach a soffit or overhang, and then the fire spreads out. Sometimes this would form a "V" pattern or a "U" pattern and would be an indicator to us that we should go to that area and look to see what was burning in that area.

- **Q.** Once you conducted your initial investigation and initial observations, what's the next thing you typically do in a fire investigation?
- A. Depending on the scene, we have walked around, typically if we can get an aerial view we try to get that, we try to understand the scene as best as possible.

During those initial walk around and photography, we would be taking photos. If we see any obvious evidence, we would stop and try to determine if we should collect that immediately to preserve that evidence. And then we would go ahead, and after coming up with our initial scenario, go ahead and examine the debris. We would layer through the debris. That means many times when a building burns there will be collapse. So you want to see is this roof material, what layer -- you take that off. Then you see if you are on a second floor or first floor, and you keep going to see if you find any evidence.

- 1 Q. Kind of like archaeology, but a shorter timeframe?
- 2 **A.** That's correct.
- 3 Q. You talked about readily observable evidence that you
- 4 | might collect initially. What type of evidence are you
- 5 | talking about there?
- 6 A. Well, in these scenes, there was instances where devices
- 7 | had not functioned. So when we found containers of gasoline
- 8 | with timing components and ignition components, we realized we
- 9 | should collect that very immediately.
- 10 | Q. Did you ever use -- you are obviously familiar with
- 11 something called accelerant. Can you tell us what that is?
- 12 **A.** ATF has a program which they train dogs to alert to the
- 13 | smell, primarily ignitable liquids that are petroleum based,
- 14 like gasoline, diesel, fuel oil, lighter fluid; things of that
- 15 | nature. These dogs are just a tool for us, because many times
- 16 | fire scenes are very, very large. And the dog will come with
- 17 a handler, and they will examine the scene, and the dog will
- 18 alert and that just gives us an idea of the place we need to
- 19 examine in depth to see what the nature of that fuel was as to
- 20 | the origin or the cause of the fire.
- 21 **Q.** As you are examining areas of depth and layering, are you
- 22 | collecting evidence as you go?
- 23 A. If we discover evidence, yes, we are collecting it.
- 24 **Q.** What would you typically collect as evidence, what types
- 25 of evidence?

- 1 **A.** In this case we were going for items that related to
- 2 | ignition. Clearly if you find componentry, timing mechanisms,
- 3 you find containers, buckets that had ignitable liquids, or
- 4 red plastic gas containers, or one-gallon jugs, we would
- 5 collect those. We would find things like batteries that
- 6 powered the ignition source; those items.
- 7 Q. Did you also collect samples of general debris or soil
- 8 | from areas?
- 9 \ \ \mathbb{A}. Many times when the dog alerted, or in these particular
- 10 | fires, the amount of ignitable liquid was so overwhelming that
- 11 | much of the liquid was absorbed in the substrate soil or the
- 12 rocks in the area that, No. 1, the odor was overwhelming to
- 13 us, so we would -- we didn't even need the dog -- we would
- 14 take samples and send those samples to the laboratory.
- 15 **Q.** Did you send the other evidence you collected to the
- 16 | laboratory also?
- 17 **A.** The majority of it, yes.
- 18 **Q.** After you had done all this, would you typically reach an
- 19 opinion in one of these cases?
- 20 A. Yes, I would.
- 21 **Q.** What -- as to what are you reaching an opinion?
- 22 \mid **A.** I would reach an opinion as to the origin of the fire and
- 23 the cause of the fire.
- 24 **Q.** So basically where it started and what caused it to start?
- 25 **A.** And how it started, yes.

- 1 Q. I would like to take you through a number of the different
- 2 | fires you investigated. Are you familiar with the plant,
- 3 | Cavel West, in Redmond, Oregon?
- 4 **a.** Yes.
- $5 \mid Q$. Are you familiar -- and that plant caught fire at a
- 6 certain point?
- 7 **A.** Yes, July 21, 1997.
- 8 Q. When did you learn about that fire?
- $9 \mid \mathbf{A}$. Early that morning.
- 10 Q. Did you go to the Cavel West plant?
- 11 **A.** Yes, I did. I responded and arrived late in the
- 12 | afternoon.
- 13 **Q.** What did you learn about the fire when you arrived?
- 14 A. I spoke to the investigators already on the scene: Randy
- 15 Davis, the fire investigator, who ran the fire department,
- 16 Ryan Fields from Oregon State Police Department, and Dave
- 17 | Fields from the Oregon State Fire Marshals office.
- 18 They informed me that the fire had been called in by a
- 19 witness who was an employee of a bakery just down the highway;
- 20 saw smoke and called 911. A police officer from the Redmond
- 21 Police Department responded, arriving before the fire
- 22 department. He circled the facility. It's a fairly large
- 23 collection of buildings, about 16,500 square feet. As he came
- 24 around the back side, west side, he saw an area that was
- 25 burning. He had a video camera, and he did record this.

MR. FOX: I am going to object to the complete narrative of this testimony.

THE COURT: Well.

MR. FOX: I would ask there be more questions.

THE COURT: I didn't think this was an area of great concern from the opening statement. You rather have question and answer, let's do that. I thought the issue was something else. Go ahead.

9 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 10 **Q.** You may have said this, and I may have missed this, did
- 11 you learn at what time roughly the fire was initially noticed?
- 12 **A.** About 4:00 in the morning.
- 13 **Q.** After the fire was reported, who arrived at the scene?
- 14 **A.** A Redmond police officer.
- 15 **Q.** Did the fire department come?
- 16 **A.** Yes, and the fire department arrived.
- 17 Q. Did you learn how long it took to contain the fire?
- 18 A. It took until approximately 6:45 a.m. for containment.
- 19 Q. Did you learn why it took so long to contain it?
- 20 A. It had developed into a massive fire, and it had burned --
- 21 like I said, the building was about 16,500 square feet.
- 22 Q. Does the fact that the fire was contained at about 6:45 --
- 23 does that mean it was out?
- 24 A. No, the fire continued to burn throughout the afternoon.
- 25 **Q.** How much water did it take to put that fire out?

- 1 **A.** They estimated it took over 2 million gallons of water.
- 2 **Q.** Did that have any effect on the local water supply?
- 3 MR. FOX: Objection, relevance.
- 4 THE COURT: You may answer.
- 5 A. Yes, it did.
- 6 THE COURT: Do I need to take this matter up, because
- 7 | I thought -- you have a standing objection it to. Go ahead.
- 8 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 9 **Q.** Did you answer it?
- 10 **A.** Yes, it did have an impact upon the water supply for the
- 11 | ci ty.
- 12 Q. What time roughly did you start processing and
- 13 | investigating the fire?
- 14 **A.** In the late afternoon of that day.
- 15 Q. Did it take you more than one day to do that?
- 16 A. Yes, it did.
- 17 Q. As part of your investigation, did you prepare a diagram
- 18 of the scene?
- 19 A. Yes, I did.
- 20 | Q. Would you take a look at Exhibit 211 and tell me if you
- 21 recognize that?
- 22 You should have a physical copy and --
- 23 **A.** Yes, I do.
- 24 **Q.** Is that the diagram you prepared?
- 25 **A.** Yes, it is.

```
1
   Q. It says approximation. Is it generally an accurate
 2
    diagram of what you saw there that day?
   Α.
        Yes.
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                            The Government offers Exhibit 211.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Objection to these?
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
 6
 7
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
8
                     (Exhibit No. 211 admitted.)
9
             THE COURT: You should have a list of the exhibits
10
    they are going to offer with this witness?
11
             MR. FOX: I don't believe I do.
             THE COURT:
                         Was it shared the exhibits that were
12
13
    going to be used with this witness.
14
             MR. FRIEDMAN: We gave it to the Court clerk and
15
    didn't realize --
16
             MR. FOX: I have no objection.
17
             THE COURT:
                         All right.
18
   BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
19
        Agent Comery, could you tell us -- could you give us a
    general description of what's shown in the diagram?
20
21
       Yes, at the north end where it says offices, that is a
    single story building wood frame, continues into the
22
23
   warehouse. As I mentioned, this is a series of building that
24
    had been cojoined and built over a period of time.
25
        From the area of the offices to the storage, that's the
```

- 1 portion that burned and that was about 16,500 square feet.
- 2 Then to the east of that is a building called the shed,
- 3 and then there was a new building under construction just to
- 4 the south of that.
- 5 **Q.** So everything but the shed and the new building burned?
- 6 A. Yes, was damaged, yes.
- 7 Q. Were aerial photographs taken at the scene?
- 8 **A.** Yes, they were.
- 9 Q. Could you take a look at Exhibit 212-A and 212-B?
- 10 | 212-A first.
- 11 **A.** Yes.
- 12 **Q.** Do you recognize that?
- 13 **A.** Yes, I do.
- 14 Q. That's an aerial photograph taken that day or shortly
- 15 | thereafter?
- 16 **A.** Yes.
- 17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers Exhibit 212-A.
- 18 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 19 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 20 (Exhibit 212-A received in evidence.)
- 21 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 22 Q. Could you describe for the jury what's shown in this
- 23 | pi cture?
- 24 A. Yes, first the main highway in the lower right-hand corner
- 25 is Route 97. And then as you cross, there's railroad tracks,

```
and then you come onto the facility. You can see almost in
the dead center of the photograph is the area of fire damage
where the roofs have burned off, and down at the south end the
building has completely burned.
```

The other point of interest is there is a residence in that area, just to the left of the main facility.

- 7 Q. Would you take a look at Exhibit 212-B? Do you recognize 8 that?
- 9 **A.** Yes, it's an aerial photograph of the scene.
- 10 **Q.** Is it a closer-up photograph?
- 11 **A.** Yes.

5

6

- 12 MR. FRIEDMAN: The Government offers Exhibit 212-B.
- 13 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 14 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 15 (Exhibit No. 212-B admitted.)
- 16 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 17 Q. Is it fair to say this is basically the plant but without
- 18 | the surroundings?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 **Q.** Now, did you find or learn of any destructive devices
- 21 during the course of this investigation?
- 22 MR. FOX: Objection, Your Honor, to the conclusion
- 23 and the leading phrasing of that question. There's no
- 24 | foundation.
- 25 THE COURT: It is noted, you may answer.

- 1 **A.** Yes, I did.
- 2 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 3 **Q.** Do you recall how many?
- 4 **A.** The remains of three devices.
- 5 | Q. Let me ask you to turn back to Exhibit 211, which has been
- 6 admitted. Can you tell us what are the Nos. 1, 2, and 3?
- 7 **A.** Yes, those relate to the areas where evidence of
- 8 | incendiary devices were located. The numbering is just the
- 9 order in which the devices were collected as evidence.
- 10 | Q. In what condition were these devices when they were found
- 11 and collected?
- 12 **A.** The device in the shed, No. 1, was found; it had not
- 13 | functioned.
- 14 o. What about device No. 2 next to the office?
- 15 **A.** No. 2, at the time of collection -- when I arrived, the
- 16 device had partially burned or almost completely burned.
- 17 | Q. Did you learn anything about the condition when the first
- 18 | firefighters arrived?
- 19 A. Yes, firefighters discovered that device intact, and I
- 20 | viewed a photograph that was taken of it when it was intact,
- 21 subsequently during the fire suppression effort that ignited.
- 22 **o.** What about device 3?
- 23 **A.** Device 3 was just the componentry and burnt evidence, the
- 24 remains of an incendiary device.
- 25 Q. Let me ask you to take a look at 212-C and tell me if you

```
recognize that?
 1
        Yes, I do.
 2
    Q.
        Can you tell what that is?
        That is the shed.
    Α.
             MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 212-C.
 5
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
 6
 7
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
8
             (Exhibit 212-C admitted.)
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
10
        Can you tell us in general terms, from what perspective we
11
   are looking at the shed?
        You are looking from the open west side of the shed.
12
13
        So the burned buildings would be to your back as you look
14
   in?
15
        Yes, that's correct.
   Α.
16
        Can you take a look at 212-D and tell me if you recognize
17
    that?
18
        Yes, I do.
19
        Is that a picture taken inside the shed?
20
        Yes, that's correct.
    Α.
21
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                             The Government offers 212-D.
22
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
             THE COURT: Admitted.
23
24
             (Exhibit 212-D admitted.)
25
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
```

- 1 Q. Agent Comery, can you tell us what is shown in this
- 2 pi cture?
- 3 **A.** In this picture we see an incendiary device and
- 4 accelerant, ignitable liquid that has been spread about the
- 5 combustibles in the shed.
- 6 Q. Is Exhibit 212-E a closer up of what's shown in 212-D?
- 7 MR. FOX: Your question was what?
- 8 **A.** To 212-E? Yes, it is.
- 9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 212-E.
- 10 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 11 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 12 (Exhi bi t 212-E admitted.)
- 13 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 14 **Q.** Agent Comery, did you study this device and how it was
- 15 designed to work?
- 16 **A.** Yes.
- 17 **Q.** Did you look at it to determine that?
- 18 A. Yes, I did.
- 19 Q. Can you walk us through that? Let me ask you first,
- 20 | there's a white square, kind of bottom center of this picture?
- 21 A. Correct.
- 22 Q. Can you tell us what that is?
- 23 A. That's a 60-minute wind-up timer, typical kitchen timer.
- 24 **Q.** And there's a red line shown across that?
- 25 **A.** Yes, that is a red plastic straw that had been adhered to

- 1 the handle of the timer.
- 2 Q. Did you determine what that straw was designed to do or
- 3 appeared to be designed to do?
- 5 | wires attached. The ends of the wires had been stripped clear
- 6 of insulation. It appeared when the timer came around to the
- 7 | zero point, the straw was designed to push the two wires
- 8 together to make complete contact.
- 9 **Q.** Maybe if you touch the screen and circle, you are maybe
- 10 able to indicate particular areas. Give that a shot.
- 11 **A.** Okay.
- 12 **Q.** You rather go with just words?
- 13 **A.** Yeah.
- 14 **Q.** The two wires you talked about, those are the two black
- 15 | wires coming out of the top of the white box?
- 16 A. Correct.
- 17 **Q.** When they were joined, what would that do to this
- 18 | apparatus?
- 19 A. It would make a complete circuit between the 9-volt
- 20 | battery and the bayonet-based light bulb that is over by the
- 21 | match books.
- 22 Q. So current would flow through that light bulb?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- 24 $| \mathbf{Q}$. Would you look at 212-F and tell me what that is?
- 25 A. That is a close-up photograph of the jug, the matches and

1 the light bulb. 2 Government offers 212-F. MR. FRI FDMAN: 3 MR. FOX: No objection. THE COURT: Admitted. 4 5 (Exhibit 212-F admitted.) 6 BY MR. FRIEDMAN: 7 Once the current flowed through the light bulb, could you 8 tell what was designed to happen next? Yes, one of the things you will notice on the light bulb 10 is that the glass bulb is missing. You can see the filament 11 has been placed between two matches in the matchbook. So it's 12 designed as the current from the 9-volt battery passes through 13 the filament, there will be resistant heating that would heat 14 up and it would ignite the matches. 15 I understand if you press the "X" in the lower left-hand 16 corner of the screen that will give you the ability to draw on 17 the screen -- exit, I mean. Do you want to try a practice 18 somewhere? 19 There. Α. 20 Once the match head is lighted, what would happen Q. 0kay. 21 next? 22 Then the flame would spread to the other match heads, and 23 then above the matchbook is a sponge that has ignitable liquid 24 in it, and the fire would spread to that. Plus there is 25 ignitable liquid spread on the floor in the area, and that

```
would ignite. And then the container of gasoline, the
 1
 2
    one-gallon jug -- the flaming sponge would cause it to melt
    and then gas would pour out and that too would ignite.
        At that point you would have a fire with at least a gallon
 4
 5
    of gas plus whatever else was spread?
    Α.
        That's correct.
 7
        Take a look at 212-G and tell me if you recognize that?
    Q.
8
        This is a five-gallon plastic bucket that was discovered
    in the sheet.
10
             MR. FRIEDMAN:
                             Government offers 212-G.
11
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
             THE COURT:
12
                         Admitted.
13
             (Exhibit No. 212-G admitted.)
    BY MR. FRIFDMAN:
14
15
        Did you notice anything significant about this bucket?
16
        It was a white bucket that had been painted black.
                                                              Al so
17
    inside the container was a liquid that smelled strongly of
18
    gasol i ne.
19
        Would you take a look at 212-H?
20
        Is that a photograph of the interior of the bucket?
21
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                             The Government offers 212-H.
22
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
23
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
24
             (Exhibit No. 212-H admitted.)
25
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
```

- 1 **Q.** Agent Comery, was there anything in this bucket when you
- 2 saw this?
- 3 **A.** There was liquid at the bottom of the bucket, yes.
- 4 **Q.** Can you estimate how much liquid?
- 5 A. Enough for us to take two samples.
- 6 Q. Did you notice, did the liquid have any smell?
- 7 A. It smelled strongly of petroleum and gasoline-based
- 8 products.
- 9 \mathbf{Q} . Did you see any similar liquid anywhere else in the shed?
- 10 A. Yes. The remnants of material was spread around the
- 11 floor, and the material had the addition of a soap to it.
- 12 Q. Before examining this device, did you or other
- 13 investigators take any steps related to it?
- 14 **A.** Yes, when this device was discovered it was prior to my
- 15 arrival on the scene. Randy Davis called the Oregon State
- 16 bomb tech and got advice on how to render it safe, and he did
- 17 cut the wires between the power supply and the light bulb.
- 18 Q. So it certainly wouldn't work as designed, as you are
- 19 looking at it?
- 20 A. That's correct.
- 21 Q. Would you take a look at 212-L and tell me if you
- 22 recognize that? Oh, I am sorry, 212-I.
- 23 A. Yes. This is a photograph of the west side of the
- 24 warehouse, and the southwest of the office portion of the
- 25 complex.

```
1
             MR. FRIEDMAN:
                            Government offers 212-I.
 2
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
 3
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
                    (Exhibit No. 212-I admitted.)
 4
   BY MR. FRIFDMAN:
 5
 6
   Q.
        You said this was the southwest side of the office?
 7
        Yes.
   Α.
8
       Was -- can you point out where in this picture device 2
   was located?
10
        In the southwest exterior of the office, which is on the
11
    left center portion of the photograph, that's where device 2
   was di scovered.
12
13
        That's the device that was intact when the firefighters
    arrived but had gone off by the time you were there?
14
15
             MR. FOX: Objection, leading. And asked and
16
    answered.
17
             THE COURT: Let's see if we can get it without -- let
18
   me do this. Let me have you step out for a moment.
                                                          Leave
19
   your books on the chair. Don't discuss the matter.
20
        (Jury not present.)
21
             THE COURT: You may be seated.
22
        My concern, Mr. Fox, is this. From your opening
23
    statement, and what you've been telling me all the time,
24
    there's no issue with the damage, what has happened here.
                                                                So
25
    it's a matter of how quickly can you get through this without
```

```
them having to question and answer until we get through.
 1
 2
    Because you are not contesting this, am I correct? Or can't
   you look at these matters and stipulate to a lot of these
   matters if you have no concern about them?
 4
 5
             MR. FOX:
                       Generally, you are correct, although we are
 6
    in trial and I am trained to make objections when I hear --
 7
             THE COURT:
                         Can I untrain you a little bit and make
    objections when they count? You don't have to make noise like
8
9
    a lawyer.
               Protect your client's interest as you go through.
10
    This is in an area that the concern wasn't there, so what's
11
    wrong with them getting to the issue and saying what you've
12
    got to say about it as quickly as possible?
13
             MR. FOX: I will keep that in mind, Your Honor.
14
    Thank you.
15
             THE COURT:
                         All right. Let's see if we can get the
16
   jury back in here so we can get through this.
        (Jury present.)
17
18
             THE COURT: All right.
                                     Questi on.
19
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
20
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
21
        Agent Comery, would you look at Exhibit 212-L?
22
        Yes.
   Α.
23
        Can you tell me a little more about it?
   Q.
24
        The damage that's on the screen?
   Α.
25
    0.
        No, 212-L.
```

- 1 A. Sorry. This photograph was taken at the area that I
- 2 showed on the diagram that is to the southwest exterior of the
- 3 office. And what we can see here is several items in the
- 4 center of the photograph is the --
- 5 Q. Can I stop you for a moment? The Government offers 212-L.
- 6 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 7 THE COURT: Admitted.
 - (Exhibit No. 212-L admitted.)
- 9 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

- 10 Q. Now, can you tell us what this photograph shows?
- 11 **A.** There are several items of interest in this photograph.
- 12 No. 1, there is the remains of a tube of fire paste. No. 2,
- 13 there is the remains of a red plastic container. There is
- 14 also -- No. 3 is the remains of a green sponge. And then
- 15 there is also the remains of a one-gallon plastic container.
- 16 Within that debris is also the remains of a 9-volt battery and
- 17 a timer -- 60-minute timer.
- 18 \mathbf{Q} . Did you draw any conclusion as to the similarity of these
- 19 items to the similarity of the items you found in the shed,
- 20 devi ce 1?
- 21 A. This appeared to be the same design as in the device in
- 22 | shed 1.
- 23 Q. Would you take a look at 212-M and tell me in general
- 24 | terms if you recognize that?
- 25 **A.** That is an aerial view of the main processing portion of

```
1
    the building.
 2
             MR. FRI FDMAN:
                            Government offers Exhibit 212-M.
 3
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
             THE COURT:
                          Admitted.
 4
 5
                     (Exhibit No. 212-M admitted.)
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
 6
 7
        Then would you take a look at 212-N and tell me what that
8
   is?
        That's a close up of the area where the components of
10
    device 3 were located on the west side of the building.
11
        Closer up view of what was shown in the previous photo?
    Q.
12
        Yes.
    Α.
13
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                             Government offers 212 N.
             MR. FOX:
14
                       No objection.
15
                     (Exhibit No. 212-N admitted.)
16
   BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
17
        Agent Comery, I see a number of red spots on the bottom
18
    center.
             Can you tell us what those are?
19
              During the processing of this area, we were looking
    A. Yes.
20
    for componentry consistent with the other devices and any
21
    other evidence we could find.
22
        As we went through the debris, we would just place a flag
23
    in it because we were going to try to collect it in its
24
    entirety.
25
        So those flags are the locations of items you found
```

- 1 si gni fi cant?
- 2 **A.** Yes.
- 3 Q. The wall behind them has black streaks; can you tell us
- 4 | what that is?
- $5 \mid A$. A fairly unusual fire pattern in comparison to the rest of
- 6 that wall. We see that there has been sooting and staining of
- 7 the wall. And then right above that concrete foundation, you
- 8 see an area of wood wall. This is one of those fire patterns
- 9 | where you can see a general pattern where the fire damage gets
- 10 wider as it goes up to the top of the wall, almost to the end.
- 11 Q. What does that tell a fire investigator?
- 12 A. In looking at the debris below the stain on the wall, we
- 13 knew from conversations with employees of the facility, that
- 14 nothing was stacked up there. Any time we see burning on the
- 15 exterior of the building we would look for naturally occurring
- 16 | fuel; in this instance wood pallets or something of that
- 17 | nature. There was not evidence of that, and no report of
- 18 pallets stored in the area. When we started to process the
- 19 debris, we did find the componentry from a device and then the
- 20 | characteristic odor of gasoline.
- 21 Q. Could you take a look at 212-0 and tell me if you
- 22 recognize that?
- 23 **A.** Yes, I do.
- 24 **Q.** In general terms what is that?
- 25 A. That is just a close up of the area where red flags had

```
1
    been when we were processing.
                            The Government offers 212-0.
 2
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
             THE COURT:
 4
                         Admitted.
 5
                    (Exhibit No. 212-0 admitted.)
 6
   BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
 7
        Agent Comery, could you describe for the jury what you see
8
    in the picture?
        This is some of the evidence collected from that site.
10
    You can see right there is the remains of a 9-volt battery.
11
    You can see wiring in the center of the picture, and then at
12
    the upper left-hand, you see the remains of melted plastic.
13
       Were you able to tell what type of plastic item that was
14
    that is melted there?
15
      It was a type of white plastic consistent with what you
16
   would see from the remains of a five-gallon container.
17
       How do these items compare to the items you found in the
18
    shed, device 1?
19
        It would appear it was of the same design. The difference
20
    was we found two timers in this location. We found one 9-volt
21
    battery, but also found an undamaged battery, or rather, Agent
22
    Davis found that just several feet away on the railroad
    tracks, a 9-volt that was not damaged.
23
24
       Was any testing done of the items that you've labeled as
```

items 1, 2 and 3?

- 1 **A.** Yes.
- 2 **Q.** What did the result of the testing show?
- 3 A. The test came back positive for the presence of gasoline
- 4 and a heavy petroleum distillate.
- 5 **Q.** What do you mean by that?
- 6 A. That's typically a diesel or fuel oil No. 2.
- 7 **Q.** Were both of those found in the same sample?
- 8 **A.** Yes.
- 9 **Q.** What inference did you draw from that?
- 10 | A. It appeared the ignitable liquid was a mixture of a
- 11 gasoline and heavy petroleum distillate.
- 12 **Q.** Possibly diesel?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 | Q. On July 30, 1997 did you interview someone named Craig
- 15 | Rosebraugh?
- 16 A. Yes, I did.
- 17 Q. Did you know who Craig Rosebraugh was when you went to
- 18 | interview him?
- 19 A. Yes, I did.
- 20 Q. Was he affiliated with any organizations?
- 21 MR. FOX: Objection, irrelevant, Your Honor.
- 22 THE COURT: Where is this going, counsel?
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, Mr. Rosebraugh is the
- 24 | spokesperson for the Earth Liberation Front.
- 25 THE COURT: Will he be testifying in the matter.

- 1 MR. FRIEDMAN: He will not be testifying?
- 2 THE COURT: Then I sustain the objection; move on.
- 3 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 4 Q. When you interviewed Mr. Rosebraugh, what did you
- 5 | interview him concerning?
- 6 A. A communiqué --
- 7 MR. FOX: Objection, Your Honor, again he's calling
- 8 | for a hearsay answer; and irrelevance.
- 9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, Mr. Rosebraugh provided
- 10 the communiqué for this action --
- 11 THE COURT: Well, it might have been, but let's move
- 12 on to the next question.
- 13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, could I ask a related
- 14 | questi on?
- THE COURT: Well, I don't know what the question is.
- 16 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 17 Q. Did you speak with Mr. Rosebraugh on July 30, 1997?
- 18 **A.** Yes.
- 19 **Q.** Did Mr. Rosebraugh provide you any document?
- 20 **A.** Yes, he did.
- 21 Q. Would you take a look at Exhibit 213 and tell me if you
- 22 recognize that?
- 23 **A.** Yes, I do.
- 24 **Q.** Is that the document Mr. Rosebraugh provided you?
- 25 **A.** It is a copy of the document, yes.

```
1
             MR. FRIEDMAN:
                            Government offers Exhibit 213.
             MR. FOX:
 2
                       No objection.
 3
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
                      (Exhibit No. 213 admitted.)
 4
   BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
 5
        Mr. Comery, you've read this document?
 7
        Yes, I have.
    Α.
        What does it purport to be?
        It claims to be a communiqué from the Animal Liberation
10
    Front in which they claim credit for starting the fire at
11
   Cavel West.
12
    Q. If you look at the sentence beginning on -- the first
13
    sentence. Is what you told me, basically the first sentence?
14
        Correct.
15
        What does the second sentence tell us?
16
        It states, "About 35 gallons of vegan jello was brought in
   with the team."
17
18
    Q. If we move down to about seven or eight lines up from the
19
    bottom, do you see a sentence that starts with the word
    "finally"?
20
21
        The first word on that line is "may"?
22
        Yes.
   Q.
23
        "Finally, the incendiary devices were set to ignite at
24
    exactly the same time."
```

"What is the next sentence?

- 1 A. "Unfortunately, as the battery was being connected to the
- 2 device at the refrigeration unit, a spark started that entire
- 3 area on fire."
- 4 **Q.** Three lines up from the bottom, do you see a claim as to
- 5 how much damage was done?
- 6 **A.** Yes, I do.
- 7 Q. Can you tell us what that says?
- 8 A. It says "At least \$1 million of damage has been done, and
- 9 the entire plant is currently closed and out of operation."
- 10 Q. And let me take you back up a little higher. If you go to
- 11 the fifth line, can you read a sentence that starts with the
- 12 | word "next"?
- 13 **A.** Yes, the line reads "Next, a number of large holes were
- 14 drilled into the rear wall of the slaughterhouse office to
- 15 bypass potential alarms on the doors or windows. Next, the
- 16 area that housed the refrigeration units was located, and
- 17 again large holes were drilled through the wall at that part
- 18 of the slaughterhouse."
- 19 **Q.** Then the following sentence.
- 20 A. Then it says, "Two teams then poured the jello into the
- 21 | numerous holes and quickly began to assemble the three
- 22 electrically-timed incendiary devices that would bring to a
- 23 | screeching halt what countless protests and letter writing
- 24 campaigns could never stop."
- 25 **Q.** After receiving this, did investigators do any follow-up

- 1 investigation?
- 2 **A.** Yes, we did.
- 3 **Q.** Can you tell us what that was?
- 4 **A.** Yes. Based upon the information about drilling holes, we
- 5 remembered that when we were processing the scene by device to
- 6 the southwest of the office, we had seen a hole drilled in the
- 7 | side of the wall.
- 8 Q. Let me ask you to turn back to 212-J which is already in 9 evidence.
- 10 Do you see anything related to what you just said there?
- 11 **A.** Yes. In the upper right-hand corner, you can see a hole
- 12 | in the siding of the building.
- 13 Q. What did investigators do after they returned and saw
- 14 | that?
- 15 **A.** They collected it as evidence.
- 16 **Q.** Did they collect anything else?
- 17 A. Yes, when they cut that piece out, they then -- Randy
- 18 Davis, then noticed that there was ignitable liquid, kind of a
- 19 gel with a soap that was in the crawl space near that hole.
- 20 | So we collected a sample of that.
- 21 **Q.** Was that sample sent to the laboratory for testing?
- 22 **A.** Yes.
- 23 Q. What were the results of that testing?
- 24 **A.** Came back presence for gasoline and HPD.
- 25 **Q.** During the course of your investigation, did you learn

- 1 | what the damage to Cavel West was?
- 2 **A.** Yes.
- 3 **Q.** What did you learn?
- 4 **A.** That it was approximately \$1,200,000.
- $5 \mid Q$. Did you reach any opinion as to the cause and origin of
- 6 this fire?
- 7 **A.** Yes.
- $8 \mid Q$. Would you tell us what that opinion is?
- 9 A. Yes. The area of origin was the west side of the
- 10 processing plant, the area on the diagram where device No. 3
- 11 was collected. The fire was caused by the initiation of the
- 12 device which ignited the flammable liquids, the ignitable
- 13 | liquids that had been spread in that area.
- 14 **Q.** Agent Comery, did you also investigate a fire that took
- 15 place on November 30 of 1997 at the BLM horse corrals at
- 16 Burns, Oregon?
- 17 **A.** Yes, I did.
- 18 **Q.** Can you tell us, what is BLM?
- 19 **A.** Bureau of Land Management.
- 20 **Q.** What was the purpose of this horse corral; what did it do?
- 21 A. The Bureau of Land Management maintains the corral to
- 22 house wild horses that exceed the carrying capacity of the
- 23 range in that area. They bring the horses in and keep them
- 24 | there.
- 25 **Q.** When did you first learn of the fire that took place at

- 1 the horse corral?
- 2 **A.** That day at the fire.
- 3 **Q.** When did you go to the scene?
- 4 **A.** The next day we traveled to the scene.
- 5 \mathbf{Q} . What did you learn about the fire when you arrived on the
- 6 scene?
- 7 **A.** I was informed that the fire had been discovered at 8:00
- 8 | in the morning on the 30th. This is the Sunday after
- 9 Thanksgiving. Two Bureau of Land Management employees had
- 10 come to the facility to take care of the horses. When they
- 11 came to the front gate, the lock on the gate would not open
- 12 with their key. They then looked and realized the lock had
- 13 been replaced, and on the ground was the cut lock that they
- 14 usually opened.
- They then noticed there was smoke in the area coming from
- 16 where the barn was.
- 17 Q. Did you go observe the barn?
- 18 A. Yes, I did.
- 19 Q. What did you see when you went to see the barn?
- 20 \mathbf{A} . The barn was totally destroyed and the roof -- the metal
- 21 roof had collapsed down to the ground.
- 22 **Q.** Did you learn anything about anything else that had
- 23 happened at the site, any --
- 24 **A.** Yes.
- 25 **Q.** What did you learn?

- 1 A. There was a John Deere diesel tractor with a trailer full
- 2 of hay that was parked near the barn, and there were two
- 3 incendiary devices, one under the engine and one within the
- 4 cab of the tractor.
- 5 **Q.** Had those devices gone off?
- 6 A. They had not.
- 7 o. What about the horses that were at the corral?
- 8 A. Most of the horses were still in the facility, but some of
- 9 the fence had been removed and some of the horses had escaped.
- 10 Q. Did you process that scene over several days?
- 11 A. Yes, I did.
- 12 **Q.** Did you prepare any diagram of the scene?
- 13 A. Yes, I did.
- 14 Q. Would you take a look at Exhibit 221 and tell me if you
- 15 recognize that -- it should be a two-page document?
- 16 A. That's correct, it's the diagram I produced of the whole
- 17 barn.
- 18 **Q.** Is that an accurate diagram?
- 19 **A.** Yes, it is.
- 20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 221.
- 21 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 22 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 23 (Exhi bi t No. 221 admitted.)
- 24 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 25 Q. Agent Comery, looking at the first page of that, could you

- 1 describe what that shows?
- 2 **A.** This building is approximately 96 feet long and about 50
- 3 | feet wide. It had a metal roof. The sides were wood fencing.
- 4 | What was unusual is there were two single-story wood frame
- 5 structures within the barn itself. In the upper left-hand
- 6 corner you can see there's a small 10 by 14-foot building
- 7 | called the tack room. And then in the center of the top of
- 8 the diagram, you can see something labeled the office, and it
- 9 has a bathroom as part of that building. That's about 325
- 10 square feet.
- 11 Q. Turning to the second page of that exhibit, can you tell
- 12 us what that shows?
- 13 **A.** This is just a blow up of the area of interest around the
- 14 office.
- 15 **Q.** There are three letters, C, D, and E; what do they mean?
- 16 **A.** They correspond to evidence collected related to
- 17 | incendiary devices. The first incendiary devices were -- A
- 18 was under the tractor, and B was in the cab. And when we
- 19 started to process the barn, we just continued to label them
- 20 as such.
- 21 Q. Would you take a look at Exhibit 222-A and tell me what
- 22 that is?
- 23 A. That is a photograph of the entrance to the facility and
- 24 the gate.
- 25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers Exhibit 222-A.

```
1
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
 2
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
                     (Exhibit No. 222-A admitted.)
 3
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
 4
 5
        Then can you turn to Exhibit 222-D, and tell me what that
 6
   is?
 7
        This is a photograph of the tractor with the trailer, and
8
    on the far left-hand side you can see the remains of the whole
    barn.
                             Government offers Exhibit 222-D.
10
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
11
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
12
13
                     (Exhibit No. 222-D admitted.)
    BY MR. FRIFDMAN:
14
15
        Could you just point out when you are referring to the
16
    remains of the whole barn, to what are you referring?
17
        That area right there. (Indicating.)
    A.
18
        Would you take a look at Exhibit 222-E and tell me what
19
    that is a picture of?
20
    A. That is a picture of the area underneath the engine of the
21
    tractor where a device was found.
22
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                            The Government offers 222-E.
23
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
             THE COURT:
24
                          Admitted.
25
                     (Exhibit No. 222-E admitted.)
```

```
BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
 1
        Is 222-F a closer-up shot of the same device?
 2
    Α.
        That's correct.
             MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 222-F.
 4
 5
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
 6
 7
                     (Exhibit No. 222-F admitted.)
8
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
        Were the two devices found on the tractor, the one in and
10
    the one under -- were they generally similar or were there
11
    significant differences between them?
12
        The only difference was the presence of what's called a
13
    super-match in the componentry of the one in the cab.
14
        Why don't we go to that one and work through that.
                                                             Woul d
15
    you look at Exhibit 222-G, tell me what that is?
        Yes, this is the interior of a cab of the tractor.
16
                            Government offers 222-G.
17
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
18
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
19
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
20
                     (Exhibit No. 222-G admitted.)
21
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
22
        Can you tell us what's significant to you in that picture?
    0.
23
        Several things. You can see the residues of ignitable
    Α.
24
    liquid that had been mixed with the soap that had been spread
25
    and splattered around the area of the seat, the console and
```

On the floor three super-matches. Those are just 1 wi ndow. 2 matches that are very large matches that have wood fiber base. They should sustain burning for a period of time. see an ignition component down there, which is a pack of 4 matches that has a rocket igniter in the center of it. 5 6 up on the console, you see the timing mechanism. And that is 7 a 60-minute timer with an attached 9-volt battery and wires. 8 The wires have been cut by Detective Coleman, and then the wires went to alligator clips that went over to a pack of 10 matches -- several books of matches that have the rocket 11 igniter inside it. And they are placed on top a super-match, 12 which is placed on top a sponge with ignitable liquids. 13 then the one-gallon container contained ignitable liquid. 14

- Q. So, how do, if you look at the device? You talked a moment ago about rocket igniter and super-match. How do those compare to the device we saw earlier at Cavel West?
- 17 A. This is just a little more sophisticated. The rocket
 18 igniter is not as fragile as the element of the light bulb.
- 19 **Q.** It's still a wire through which current flows and which 20 heats up?
- 21 A. That's correct, and would create a flame.

15

- 22 **Q.** Would you take a look at 222-I and tell me what that is? 23 I am sorry, I have moved you too fast. 222-H.
- 24 **A.** That is a photograph, a closer-up photograph of the timer 25 and the one-gallon jug.

```
1
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                             Government offers 222-H.
             MR. FOX:
 2
                        No objection.
             THE COURT:
 3
                         Admitted.
                     (Exhibit No. 222-H admitted.)
 4
 5
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
 6
        Can you show us where you are referring to some wires that
 7
    had been cut a moment ago?
8
        Yes, the red dot right in the center of the photograph;
    you can see the wire is cut.
10
        That originally connected to the timer?
   Q.
11
        Yes.
   Α.
        Would you look at 222-1?
12
    0.
13
        This is a close-up photograph of the timer on the console.
        What identifications had been made: what's been done to
14
15
    this timer?
16
        The timer has a 9-volt battery --
17
        I am sorry, Government offers 222-1.
    Q.
18
             MR. FOX:
                        No objection.
19
             THE COURT:
                          Admitted.
20
                     (Exhibit No. 222-I admitted.)
21
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
22
        Let me ask you to start again.
23
        The timer has a 9-volt battery attached to the right-hand
24
           A snap connector is on top of the battery, the wire
25
    goes to the very top of the timer and you can see the ends;
```

- 1 the installation has been peeled off that. Adjacent to that
- 2 is another wire that also has the insulation removed. On the
- 3 | timer itself you can see a toothpick has been taped to the
- 4 handle.
- 5 | Q. When you discovered this timer, at what time was it or
- 6 | what time was it set?
- 7 **A.** This timer had run to zero.
- 8 Q. Were you able to determine why this device didn't go off?
- 9 **A.** What we saw was when the toothpick reached that area, it
- 10 | had not pushed the two wires to connect.
- 11 Q. Would you take a look at Exhibit 222-J and tell me what
- 12 | that is?
- 13 A. It is a close-up photograph of the matchbook, sponge,
- 14 | super-match and jug.
- 15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 222-J.
- 16 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 17 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 18 (Exhibit No. 222-J admitted.)
- 19 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 20 | Q. Could you point out for the jury each of the items you
- 21 just referred?
- 22 A. You can see on this -- the first thing you see is the
- 23 alligator clips at the end of the wires coming from the 9-volt
- 24 battery and from the timer. Then you see bare wire that
- 25 | that's attached to. What you don't see is the bare wire is

```
attached to one end of the rocket igniter. You see several
 1
 2
    books of matches that the cover has been bent back and been
    taped together with the super-match, and then you see the
 4
   yellow sponge and the one-gallon jug.
 5
        So when the timer closed the circuit and current flowed
 6
    through these wires, what would happen with this device?
 7
        It was designed so that the rocket igniter would cause the
8
    matches to ignite.
                       The fire would spread to the super-match
    and spread to the ignitable liquid-soaked sponge. And then of
10
    course it would cause the destruction of the plastic
11
    one-gallon jug, which would then spill its contents and that
12
    would ignite, plus the ignitable liquid mixture had been
13
    spread around the cab. That too would ignite.
14
        Would you take a look at 222-K and tell me what that is?
15
        That is a close-up photograph of one of the books of
16
    matches.
                            Government offers 222-K.
17
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
18
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
19
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
20
                     (Exhibit No. 222-K admitted.)
21
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
22
        Agent Comery, is this matchbook in the condition it was
23
    originally in when it was found?
24
        No, I have peeled back the matches to expose the rocket
```

igniter.

```
1 Q. Could you point that out for the jury?
```

- 2 **A.** Right above the red dot is the rocket igniter.
- 3 \mathbf{Q} . Agent Comery, would you turn to 222-L and tell us what
- 4 that is?

- 5 **A.** It is a photograph of the fire damaged barn.
 - MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 222 L.
- 7 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 8 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 9 (Exhi bi t No. 222-L admitted.)
- 10 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 11 Q. Then would you look at Exhibit 222-N?
- 12 **A.** Yes. That is another photograph just showing the
- 13 destruction of the pole barn.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 222-N.
- MR. FOX: No objection.
- 16 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 17 (Exhibit No. 222-N admitted.)
- 18 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 19 Q. This is obviously taken from a different perspective than
- 20 the previous one?
- 21 **A.** Yes.
- 22 Q. Can you see what used to be the roof of the pole barn in
- 23 | this picture?
- 24 **A.** Yes, the metal is the roofing material.
- 25 **Q.** The left of the center of the picture?

- 1 **A.** Yes.
- 2 Q. Would you look at 222-Q, and tell us what that is?
- $3 \mid \mathbf{A}$. This is a photograph taken after the metal roofing had
- 4 been removed from the area, exposing the damage to the side of
- 5 the office.
- 6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 222-Q.
- 7 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 8 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 9 (Exhibit No. 222-Q admitted.)
- 10 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 11 **Q.** Agent Comery, do you see any items here that were in the
- 12 diagram that you originally drew of the scene?
- 13 **A.** Yes.
- 14 **Q.** Can you tell us what those are?
- 15 \mathbf{A} . I indicated on the diagram, the file cabinets, the garbage
- 16 can, and the table and the front door to the office.
- 17 **Q.** Are these in the position they were when you found them?
- 18 **A.** Yes.
- 19 Q. Let's turn back to Exhibit 221, the first page of that on
- 20 your diagram.
- 21 Do you have that up on your screen?
- 22 **A.** Yes, I do.
- 23 Q. Do you see those same items in that diagram?
- 24 A. Yes, right above C are the three file cabinets. Right
- 25 above D is labeled "table." And then right above E is the

- 1 | indicator that that's a door.
- 2 Q. So turning back again to 222-0, these are basically the
- 3 same items, from the same perspective, roughly?
- 4 **a.** Correct.
- 5 | Q. Did you use an accelerant dog in the investigation of this
- 6 | fire?
- 7 A. Yes. Oregon Police Detective Mark Merrill had his dog
- 8 Deacon, and we used him when we processed the scene at the
- 9 barn.
- 10 **Q.** What happened when you used Deacon?
- 11 A. Deacon alerted to the area along that side of the office.
- 12 **Q.** When you say Deacon alerted, what do you mean by that?
- 13 A. The dog is trained to catch a cone of the scent and follow
- 14 | it to its source. The richest portion of the scent in the dog
- 15 came to the area by the front door. And there was a little
- 16 confusion, because the dog was overwhelmed by the scent. So
- 17 there was a wide area which the dog was alerting to.
- 18 Q. How does that area relate to what you had marked down as
- 19 C, D and E on your chart?
- 20 A. We then processed that area and we found the remains of
- 21 componentry relating to an incendiary device.
- 22 Q. Was Deacon alerting to the area that you have indicated as
- 23 C, D and E?
- 24 A. All along that area.
- 25 Q. Would you take a look at 222-0 and tell us what that is?

```
Yes, that's part of some items found in the debris by the
 1
 2
    area marked C.
                            Government offers 222-0.
 3
             MR. FRIEDMAN:
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
 4
 5
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
                     (Exhibit No. 222-0 admitted.)
 6
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
 7
8
    Q. Can you tell us what you see of significance in that
    picture?
        Two items of significance: One is the remains of a 9-volt
10
11
    battery, and the other is the main spring, metal spring from a
    60-minute timer.
12
13
    Q. Is that consistent with the timers you found in the truck
    cab -- in the tractor cab and under the tractor?
14
15
        Yes, they also had large metal springs.
16
        Would you look at 222-P and tell us what that is?
        This is debris in the area that was marked D on the
17
18
    di agram.
19
             MR.
                 FRI EDMAN:
                            Government offers 222-P.
20
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
21
             THE COURT:
                          Admitted.
22
                     (Exhibit No. 222-P admitted.)
23
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
24
        Agent Comery, could you outline what you see that is
25
    si gni fi cant?
```

```
In the center of the photograph there's two points of
 1
 2
    interest, one is at the bottom; you can see the remains of a
    9-volt battery. Then where the flagging material is, just to
    the right of that arrow, are some wires.
 4
        Would you look at Exhibit 222-S, and tell me what that is?
 5
   Q.
        This is debris that was located in the area by the door to
 7
    the office, the door on the diagram marked E.
8
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                            Government offers 222-S.
             MR. FOX:
9
                       No objection.
10
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
11
                     (Exhibit No. 222-S admitted.)
   BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
12
13
        What items of significance are in this photograph?
14
        In the upper left-hand area, you can see a metal spring,
    and then in the center of the photograph, you can see the
15
16
    remains of paper matches, the faint remains.
17
        Now, were fluids from the two intact devices, devices A
18
    and B, and samples found from C, D and E tested in this case?
19
        The debris samples were found. We didn't find fluids per
         We collected debris and put it in a can, and it was
20
21
    tested and it came back for the presence of gasoline, HPD --
22
    gasoline and heavy petroleum distillate.
23
       On December 6, 1997, did you again interview Craig
```

Objection, irrelevance, calls for hearsay.

24

25

Rosebraugh?

MR. FOX:

- 1 | We don't have any objection if he gave them something --
- 2 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's going to be where we are going.
- 3 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 4 **Q.** Did you meet with Mr. Rosebraugh on December 6 of 1997?
- 5 **A.** Yes.
- 6 Q. During the course of that interview, did you receive or
- 7 | show him the communiqué relating to this action?
- 8 A. I received.
- 9 Q. Did you discuss a communiqué?
- 10 MR. FOX: Objection, Your Honor. Mr. Rosebraugh is
- 11 giving him something --
- 12 THE COURT: I think we are going to get to that. You
- 13 | have no objection to admitting what was given to him. Can we
- 14 get there?
- MR. FOX: I thought he was testifying he was giving
- 16 Mr. Rosebraugh something.
- 17 THE COURT: Let's see if we can get it straight.
- 18 | Questi on?
- 19 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 20 Q. Was there a communiqué that was part of your meeting with
- 21 Mr. Rosebraugh?
- 22 A. Yes. I did discuss that.
- 23 Q. Would you take a look at Exhibit 223?
- 24 **A.** Yes, that is a copy of a communiqué.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 223.

```
1
             MR. FOX:
                       Your Honor, May I voir dire the agent on
 2
    this point for one minute?
 3
             THE COURT:
                          About whether he gave it to him or not?
             MR. FOX:
                       I guess my question --
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Ask him, counsel.
 6
                         VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
    BY MR. FOX:
 7
8
        Did you show Mr. Rosebraugh this communiqué or did
        Rosebraugh give it to you?
10
        Mr. Rosebraugh gave this to me, a copy.
    Α.
11
             THE COURT: All right.
                                      Continue.
12
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection, Your honor.
13
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                             Government offers 223.
14
             THE COURT: Is there any objection?
15
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
16
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
17
                      (Exhibit No. 223 admitted.)
18
                     DIRECT EXAMINATION - CONTINUED
19
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
        Agent Comery, did this communiqué relate to the arson at
20
21
    Burns, Oregon we just discussed?
22
        Yes, it is.
    Α.
23
        Can you read the first paragraph for the jury?
24
         "In the spirit of Crazy Horse and Geronimo, members of
25
    the Animal Liberation Front and Earth Liberation Front
```

- 1 combined efforts to help halt the BLM's illegal and immoral
- 2 business of rounding up wild horses from public land and
- 3 funneling them to slaughter, as the Associated Press uncovered
- 4 in January of 1997 after an intensive investigation."
- $5 \mid \mathbf{Q}$. If we turn to the second paragraph, about eight or nine
- 6 lines down, there's a sentence "after many gates"?
- 7 **A.** "Starting with the horses and ponies kept nearest the
- 8 | barn, the teams opened gates and barked like dogs to frighten
- 9 | the horses into the chutes that would lead them to the open
- 10 range."
- 11 **Q.** Moving down to the bottom of that paragraph, five lines
- 12 before the end, there's a sentence that begins "the signal"?
- 13 **A.** "The signal was given and the demolition crew set to work
- 14 | spreading hay and fuel in a large tractor and around the
- 15 office and refrigerator units where the pharmaceuticals
- 16 | intended for these wild horses were kept. A number of
- 17 | incendiary devices were constructed and placed and all the
- 18 | team members quickly exited in the crisp night wind."
- 19 Q. Were those last two sentences consistent with the evidence
- 20 you had seen when you were at the scene?
- 21 **A.** They are, except we did not find the hay around the
- 22 refrigerator because that whole area was burned up.
- 23 **Q.** But the portion about where the devices were set was
- 24 | consistent with what you saw?
- 25 **A.** Yes.

```
1
        During the course of your investigation, did you determine
   how much damage had been done to this Wild Horse corral?
 2
   Α.
        Yes, it was estimated $193,000.
        Did you reach a conclusion as to the cause and origin of
    this fire?
 5
   Α.
       Yes, I did.
 7
       What was that conclusion?
8
        The fire origin was underneath -- inside the pole barn,
    but the entrance to the office, where device or devices --
10
   incendiary devices had functioned, causing the ignition of the
11
    introduced fuel and the subsequent burning of the building.
12
    Q. I am about to start another fire. I would be happy to do
13
    that, but I thought the Court might want to take a recess.
             THE COURT: Let's take a quick recess and then come
14
15
    back and get the rest of it.
16
        Take about 10 or 15 minutes, and I will have you back here
17
    and we will finish up the day.
        Leave your books on the chair and don't discuss the case.
18
19
        (Jury not present.)
             THE COURT: All right, you may be seated.
20
                                                         We will
21
    take the afternoon recess.
22
        (Afternoon recess.)
23
             THE COURT:
                         Ready to bring them in.
24
        (Jury present.)
```

All right. You may be seated.

25

THE COURT:

- 1 Mr. Friedman.
- 2 MR. FRIEDMAN: May I continue Your Honor?
- THE COURT: Yes.
- 4 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 5 Q. Good afternoon again, Agent Comery. Let me move you along
- 6 to another fire.
- 7 Did you participate in investigating a fire of the
- 8 | National Wildlife Research center in Olympia?
- 9 **a.** Yes.
- 10 Q. Do you recall when that fire took place?
- 11 **A.** June 21, 1998.
- 12 **Q.** Was there actually more than one fire that night?
- 13 **A.** Yes, there was.
- 14 **Q.** What else was burned that night?
- 15 A. An Animal Damage Control office and shop in Olympia,
- 16 Washi ngton.
- 17 Q. Were those both Department of Agriculture facilities?
- 18 **A.** Yes, they were.
- 19 Q. When did you arrive -- let's start with the National
- 20 | Wildlife Research Center. When did you arrive to begin
- 21 research there?
- 22 **A.** The next morning, the 22nd.
- 23 Q. Were you the lead investigator for that fire?
- 24 **A.** No.
- 25 **Q.** Had you been the lead investigator for the two previous

- 1 | fires we talked about?
- 2 **A.** Yes.
- $3 \mid \mathbf{Q}$. Who was the lead investigator this time around?
- 4 A. Dean Wetzel from ATF in Seattle.
- 5 Q. When you arrived at the National Wildlife Research Center,
- 6 | what did you learn about the fire?
- 7 | A. I learned that the fire had occurred in the early morning
- 8 hours after 2:00 when an alarm functioned in the building.
- 9 The Thurston County District No. 11 responded and discovered
- 10 | fire burning in several locations in the building.
- 11 Q. Did one of the investigators prepare a diagram of the
- 12 National Wildlife Research Center?
- 13 A. No, I did not, excuse me.
- 14 Q. Would you take a look at Exhibit 231?
- 15 You told us firefighters arrived and there was a fire
- 16 involving the whole building. What happened after that? Did
- 17 you learn what had happened after the firefighters arrived?
- 18 **A.** Yes, there was damage to the building, and they suppressed
- 19 the fire.
- 20 **Q.** Exhibit 231, do you recognize that?
- 21 **A.** Yes.
- 22 **Q.** Could you tell us what that is?
- 23 A. That is a rough diagram prepared by an individual, Bryan
- 24 Christensen -- a rough diagram of the facility.
- 25 | Q. Was Bryan Christensen one of the people investigating that

1 | fire?

2

5

8

- **A.** I believe he was with the fire department.
- **Q.** Although rough, is it generally accurate?
- 4 **A.** Yes.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: The Government offers Exhibit 231.
- 6 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 7 THE COURT: Admitted.
 - (Exhibit No. 231 admitted.)

9 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

- 10 Q. Looking at the diagram, can you explain for the jury what
- 11 | it shows?
- 12 A. Yes. This was an L-shape or T-shape building. It was a
- 13 | single story wood frame building. And the significant areas
- 14 are the entrance area, the foyer, the east and west; and then
- 15 there is on the east entrance of the building, right here, and
- 16 then there's an area of interest where there was fire damage
- 17 on the west side. The arrow is pointing in the wrong
- 18 di recti on.
- 19 Q. Jump ahead to your conclusion, just so we can use this
- 20 diagram. Did you ultimately determine how many points of
- 21 origin there were for this fire?
- 22 **A.** Yes, three distinct areas of origin.
- 23 Q. Could you indicate on the diagram where those were?
- 24 A. Yes, again, on the -- the first one was on the west foyer
- 25 region. The second one was on the west wall, and the third

- 1 was by the east entrance.
- 2 **Q.** Now, was there an accelerant dog used as part of the
- 3 investigation of this fire?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 **Q.** Do you recall what happened when that dog was used?
- 6 A. Yes, the dog alerted in the three areas that have been
- 7 described.
- 8 Q. Were the burn patterns in those areas significant to you?
- 9 **A.** Yes, they were.
- 10 Q. In general terms, why or how is that?
- 11 **A.** Well, two areas specifically. The west side area, there
- 12 is a distinct burn pattern that extends to the base of the
- 13 wall, and there is burning in a water control box that is
- 14 below grade. That was highly unusual.
- 15 And then the other area, the east entrance, there is
- 16 another very discreet burn pattern on the exterior of the
- 17 | wall. And then the patterns in the west foyer area, there was
- 18 so much damage in there that the patterns themselves were not
- 19 distinctive to origin, but it was the samples recovered from
- 20 | that area that was important.
- 21 Q. Would you look at Exhibit 232-A and tell us what that is?
- 22 **A.** Yes. That is a photograph showing the east foyer.
- 23 **Q.** You referred a moment ago to one of the points of origin.
- 24 One of the points of origin was the west foyer, is that
- 25 | correct?

- 1 A. That is correct.
- 2 **Q.** Where on this diagram is the east foyer?
- 3 **a.** It is here.
- 4 **Q.** Is that what 232-A is a photograph of?
- 5 **A.** Yes.
- 6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 232-A.
- 7 MR. FOX: Objection. Agent, is this on the Blomberg
- 8 or 0' Leary Tocation?
- 9 **A.** Blomberg.
- 10 MR. FOX: I have no objection.
- 11 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 12 (Exhibit No. 232-A admitted.)
- 13 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 14 Q. Agent Comery, now that we are looking at this picture,
- 15 could you tell us what what this shows?
- 16 A. It shows an area of greater fire damage coming from the
- 17 foyer entrance. You can see the fire damage is all the way to
- 18 the base of the walls and extends up into the roof. A lot of
- 19 the roof assembly over the entrance foyer has been destroyed
- 20 and then less damage extending out to the sides of the foyer.
- 21 Q. Would you look at Exhibit 232-B and tell us what that
- 22 shows, or is?
- 23 A. This is a photograph of the west side, and in the center
- 24 of the photograph you can just see a little bit of the west
- 25 | foyer area.

```
1
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                             Government offers 232-B.
             MR. FOX:
 2
                        No objection.
 3
             THE COURT:
                          Admitted.
                     (Exhibit No. 232-B admitted.)
 4
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
 5
 6
        This is a photograph of the foyer from the opposite side
 7
    of the building?
8
    Α.
        Yes.
        Can you point out what you see as significant here?
10
        A burn damage of the west foyer and also the discreet burn
   Α.
11
    pattern on the west side of the wall.
12
        So is this showing one or two points of origin?
13
        Showing two areas of origin.
14
        Are the areas -- the arrows you've indicated are those
15
   areas?
16
        Approximate. The arrow for the foyer is off just a bit.
   Α.
        Would you look at 232-C, tell me what that is?
17
18
        This is a photograph of the west side of the building
19
    showing the burn pattern.
20
        The second of the two areas you indicated?
    Q.
21
        That's correct.
    A.
22
                             Government offers 232-C.
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
23
             MR. FOX:
                        No objection.
24
             THE COURT:
                          Admitted.
25
                     (Exhibit No. 232-C admitted.)
```

- 1 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 2 **Q.** Can you explain what's significant about that photograph?
- B A. You can see the burning extends all the way down to the
- 4 ground and there's burning underneath the wood along the
- 5 | foundation. The pattern extends up to the soffit and then
- 6 extends underneath the overhang and there's burning damage
- 7 | right in that area of the attic. You can see this pattern is
- 8 fairly isolated and discreet.
- $9 \mid \mathbf{Q}$. Why is that significant?
- 10 A. It makes you want to investigate to see what caused this
- 11 discreet burning. Is it an area of origin or is there an
- 12 explanation in the burning dynamics that would explain that?
- 13 **Q.** You investigated that, I assume?
- 14 **A.** Yes.
- 15 **Q.** Would you look at 232-D, tell us what that is?
- 16 A. This is a close up of the base of the wall that we just
- 17 descri bed.
- 18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 232-D.
- 19 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 20 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 21 (Exhi bi t No. 232-D admitted.)
- 22 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 23 **Q.** What does this photograph show, Agent Comery?
- 24 A. It shows the base of the wall, and one of the things you
- 25 can see is the recessed area where the water pipe shut-off

```
And there's burning in that area, burning along the
 1
 2
    ground, the grass. You see burning, heavy burning right at
    the base of the wall, that the burn damage, the consumption,
    the char depth is greater in that area than above that area.
 5
        I point out a recessed area. Can you show us where that
   Q.
 6
    is?
 7
        Right at the base of that line.
    Α.
8
        Is 232-E a photograph of that recessed area?
    Q.
        Yes, it is.
    Α.
10
             MR. FRIEDMAN:
                            Government offers 232-E.
11
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
             THE COURT:
12
                         Admitted.
13
                     (Exhibit No. 232-E admitted.)
    BY MR. FRIFDMAN:
14
15
        So this is a photograph looking down into that area?
16
        Correct.
   Α.
        Can you tell us what you see of significance in that
17
18
    photograph?
19
    A. Yes, on the left side of the recessed area, there is a
```

19 A. Yes, on the left side of the recessed area, there is a 20 metal handle consistent with the remains of a five-gallon

21 bucket, and there's wood debris from the side of the box that

22 is burned. There's also -- attached to that metal handle was

23 plastic, melted plastic and burned plastic.

24

25

Q. Could I get you to indicate on the screen where you see that bucket handle?

- 1 **a.** The top of the red line.
- 2 Q. Then you look at Exhibit 232-F and tell us what that is?
- 3 **A.** This is a photograph of the east entrance on the north section of the building.
- 5 **Q.** What you described earlier as the third point of origin?
- 6 A. Third area of origin yes.
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 232-F.
- 8 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 9 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 10 (Exhibit No. 232-F admitted.)
- 11 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 12 **Q.** Can you describe for the jury what that picture shows?
- 13 **A.** Again we can see isolated exterior fire damage extending
- 14 all the way to the ground. There is no communication from the
- 15 other fire. We see low burning underneath, on the area of the
- 16 wall below the overhang.
- 17 Q. Were samples from each of these three points sent to the
- 18 | laboratory for testing?
- 19 **A.** Yes.
- 20 **Q.** What did the testing show?
- 21 A. They came back positive. The ones on the west where the
- 22 recessed wall was, came back positive for gasoline and heavy
- 23 petroleum distillate. The ones on the west foyer, one came
- 24 back positive for gasoline, and the other came back positive
- 25 | for heavy petroleum distillate. The two samples from the east

- 1 entrance, positive for gasoline and heavy petroleum
- 2 distillate.
- $3 \mid \mathbf{Q}$. Did you determine what the total damage was to this
- 4 | research center?
- 5 **A.** The estimate was approximately \$1.2 million dollars.
- 6 Q. Did you reach an opinion as to the cause and origin of
- 7 I this fire?
- 8 A. Yes, this fire was caused by ignition of introduced
- 9 | ignitable liquids at three separate areas: The west side of
- 10 the building, the west foyer and the east entrance.
- 11 Q. Now you said there were two fires that same night in
- 12 | OI ympi a?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 **Q.** Where did the other fire take place?
- 15 A. It took place at the Animal Damage Control buildings on, I
- 16 believe, 7200 0'Leary Road in Olympia, Washington.
- 17 Q. How great a distance was there between the two locations,
- 18 roughly?
- 19 **A.** Several miles.
- 20 **Q.** That's also a Department of Agriculture facility?
- 21 **A.** That is correct.
- 22 Q. Did you participate and investigate that fire?
- 23 A. Yes, I did.
- 24 Q. What did you learn about when that fire had broken out?
- 25 A. That fire had occurred after 4 a.m. in the morning. They

- 1 | learned of it when an alarm system functioned.
- 2 **Q.** How does that compare to the time when the Wildlife
- 3 | Research Facility fire took place?
- 4 **A.** Approximately two hours later.
- $5 \mid Q$. Now, the Animal Damage Control center, what made that up;
- 6 | was that one building or many buildings?
- 7 | A. Two buildings: The shop garage, which was a one-story
- 8 building about 1,000 square feet, and then the office which
- 9 | was one-story building wood frame construction, about 1780
- 10 | square feet.
- 11 Q. Would you take a look at 242-B and tell me if you
- 12 recognize that?
- 13 **A.** Yes, I do.
- 14 **Q.** Is that a photograph of the two buildings?
- 15 **A.** Yes, it is.
- 16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 242-B.
- 17 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 18 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 19 (Exhi bi t No. 242-B admitted.)
- 20 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 21 **Q.** Can you describe in general terms what this photograph
- 22 shows?
- 23 **A.** Yes. On the left side of the photograph you can see the
- 24 shop garage, and you can see burn pattern on the exterior of
- 25 the building between the main door and the garage. You see

```
that the burn pattern extends all the way to the base of the
    wall and you see the remains of two buckets in that area.
 3
        On the adjacent building, the office building, you see low
    burn at the corner, originating from the base of the building.
    Then you see an area of greater damage between the window and
    the front door, underneath the overhang at the front entrance.
        Is Exhibit 242-C a closer-up shot of the garage?
        Yes, it is.
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                            Government offers 242-C.
10
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
11
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
12
                     (Exhibit No. 242-C admitted.)
13
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
14
        You spoke a couple moments ago about buckets. Do you see
15
    those in this picture?
16
        Yes.
   Α.
17
        Can you point out where you see those?
18
        Right to the right of the garage door.
19
        Then can you look at Exhibit 242-D and tell us what that
    Q.
20
    is?
21
        This is a close up of the remains of the two buckets.
22
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                            Government offers 242-D.
23
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
24
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
25
                     (Exhibit No. 242-D admitted.)
```

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

- 1 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 2 **Q.** Agent Comery, could you describe in a little more detail
- 3 | what that picture is showing?
- 4 A. Yes, it's showing the remains of two buckets. What's
- 5 unusual is you see a mound of white material on either side of
- 6 a stack of burned debris. That white material is a soap or
- 7 detergent that was wet. It reeked of gasoline. Between the
- 8 two containers, or the remains of the two containers, are two
- 9 egg cartons; and the egg cartons were filled with a mixture of
- 10 wood fiber and wax.
- 11 Q. Would you look at Exhibit 242-E and tell me what that is?
- 12 **A.** This is a close up of componentry that was removed from
- 13 the center of the device.
- 14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 242-E.
- MR. FOX: No objection.
- 16 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 17 (Exhibit No. 242-E admitted.)
- 18 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 19 Q. Agent Comery, could you tell us what components you see in
- 20 | the picture?
- 21 **A.** We see the 9-volt battery on the left-hand side. In the
- 22 center of the photograph we see the remains of a digital alarm
- 23 clock, and it also has a power cord that's bundles. Then we
- 24 | see just associated plastic.
- 25 Q. You referred a moment ago to a digital alarm clock. How

```
does that compare to the timers we see in the earlier devices?
 1
 2
        In the previous devices we've talked about, there was a
    60-minute wind-up mechanical timer.
        Then would you look at 242-F and tell me what that is?
 4
    0.
 5
        This is a photograph of the entrance area of the office.
    Α.
 6
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
                           Government offers 242-F.
 7
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
8
             THE COURT: Admitted.
9
             (Exhibit No. 242-F admitted.)
10
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
11
        To the left do you see anything of significance?
12
        Yes a fairly discrete area of low burn damage.
                                                        And at the
13
    base of that, in the center of the pattern, you can see the
    remains of two buckets.
14
15
        Can you tell us what Exhibit 242-G is?
16
        This is a close-up picture of the remains of the device by
    the office there.
17
18
             MR. FRI EDMAN: Government offers Exhibit 242-G.
19
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
20
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
21
                     (Exhibit No. 242-G admitted.)
22
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
23
        Agent Comery, what do you see in the picture?
```

Again, the unusual mound of soap detergent that had been

in the buckets. On either side of that you can see the

24

- 1 remains of a handle from a five-gallon bucket. In the center
- 2 you can see the remains of an egg carton.
- $3 \mid Q$. Turning to 242-I, can you tell us what that is a picture
- 4 of?
- 5 | A. Yes, this is componentry that had been removed from
- 6 underneath the egg cartons.
- 7 **Q.** You said underneath the egg cartons. Is this right side
- 8 up, upside down?
- 9 A. It is upside down. We are looking at the base on the
- 10 | pavement.
- 11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 242-1.
- 12 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 13 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 14 (Exhibit No. 242-I admitted.)
- 15 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 16 **Q.** There are two semi-circles. Can you tell us what they
- 17 | are?
- 18 **A.** Yes, we have cut the plastic from the remains of the
- 19 bucket so we can put this in a sealed container and preserve
- 20 | it for the laboratory.
- 21 Q. You referred to componentry. Can you tell us what you see
- 22 | in the picture?
- 23 A. I placed a white arrow on the photograph there that's
- 24 pointing to -- and that was introduced obviously -- it's
- 25 pointing to the base of the 9-volt battery. Next to it is the

- 1 remains of a box of kitchen matches. The box has holes in it,
- 2 | in the top, and inside were the heads of kitchen matches, plus
- 3 a light bulb.
- 4 | Q. Would you turn to Exhibit 242-J and tell us what that is?
- 5 **A.** Yes, that is a picture of some rolled-up fabric that's
- 6 along the base of the wall in the office.
- 7 | Q. Did this run from -- between where and where did this run?
- 8 **A.** Remnants of this were found from the first device along
- 9 the base of the wall, across the void between the wall of the
- 10 | two buildings and then along the base of the office to the
- 11 second device.
- 12 **Q.** You said it was rolled up cloth. Anything else
- 13 | significant about this cloth?
- 14 | A. Yes. The cloth smelled strongly of petroleum products and
- 15 gasoline.
- 16 Q. So were you able to determine what the function was of
- 17 | this cloth?
- 18 **A.** The function of this was to ensure that the fire spread
- 19 from one device to the other.
- 20 Q. Sort of a fail-safe mechanism?
- 21 **A.** Possibly, yes.
- 22 Q. Now, when we talked about the devices a moment ago, you
- 23 | said they had digital timers?
- 24 A. Correct.

- different from the earlier devices, the ones the digital timers were incorporated?
 - A. There had been alterations made to the clock so that the digital clock, even though it was a plug-in clock, is designed with a backup battery so that the alarm will still function if you lose power.

Alterations had been made so that wiring from the bulb went to a read relay that then went to a power for the speaker. What would happen is on functioning of the alarm, instead of the speaker sounding, power would pass to the switch; the switch would close. And then power from the 9-volt battery, just like the previous design, would pass from the 9-volt battery to the back-up light bulb, the bayonet-base light bulb that had the glass removed, heating up the filament.

- 16 Q. Is it fair to say when the clock counted down, it's
 17 flipping an electronic switch, instead of pushing two wires
- 18 together, and once again completing a circuit?
- **A.** Yes.

- **Q.** And then functioning similarly to the devices we've seen
- 21 before?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 Q. Were you able to determine the total amount of damage to
- 24 | this facility?
- **A.** The damage to this facility was estimated about \$500,000.

- 1 Q. Did you reach a conclusion as to the cause and origin of
- 2 this fire?
- 3 **a.** Yes.
- 4 o. What was that conclusion?
- 5 **A.** The fire was caused by the functioning of the incendiary
- 6 devices that were placed on the exterior of the buildings.
- 7 | Q. Did you subsequently download a communiqué related to
- 8 | these two fires from the Internet?
- 9 A. Yes, I did.
- 10 | Q. Would you look at Exhibit 233? Do you recognize that
- 11 | document?
- 12 **A.** Yes, it's a copy of the same communiqué.
- 13 MR. FRIEDMAN: The Government offers 233.
- MR. FOX: No objection.
- 15 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 16 (Exhibit No. 233 admitted.)
- 17 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 18 Q. Agent Comery, to what fires does this communiqué relate?
- 19 A. It talks about the two fires, the one at the Western
- 20 Research Center, Wildlife Research Center, and the Animal
- 21 Damage Control.
- 22 **Q.** Would you read just the first -- well, the first
- 23 paragraph?
- 24 **A.** "This year for summer solstice, the Animal Liberation
- 25 | Front and Earth Liberation Front decided to honor the wildlife

- 1 of the great Pacific Northwest and the forests they call home
- 2 by having a bonfire (or two) at facilities which make it a
- 3 daily routine to kill and destroy wildlife."
- 4 Q. Would you turn to the last significant paragraph, the
- 5 | fifth line at the bottom, and read that?
- 6 A. "Between the 25 and 30 gallons of a 50 percent unleaded
- 7 | fuel, 50 percent diesel fuel combination was brought to the
- 8 research facility on Blomberg Road. Slightly less was
- 9 required for the smaller Animal Damage Control building on
- 10 0'Leary Road. The buckets were placed at key points and left
- 11 open so the flames could climb up the walls and shoot
- 12 underneath the eaves and ventilation holes of the building
- 13 beginning its great cleansing process."
- 14 Q. Is that description consistent with the evidence you saw
- 15 of these two incidents?
- 16 A. Yes, it is.
- 17 Q. Were you also involved investigating a fire at Childer's
- 18 | Meat Company in Oregon?
- 19 **A.** Yes.
- 20 **Q.** When did that fire take place?
- 21 **A.** May 9, 1999.
- 22 **Q.** What was -- when did you arrive on the scene, do you
- 23 recall?
- 24 A. I arrived on May 10.
- 25 | Q. Did you learn what Childer's Meat Company was?

- 1 A. It was a meat packaging plant.
- 2 Q. What did you learn about when the fire had broken out and
- 3 | what had happened after that?
- 4 **A.** The fire was discovered about 3:00 in the morning. The
- 5 | Lane County rural fire department responded and found the
- 6 | building, the main portion, the entrance of the office,
- 7 burning.
- 8 **Q.** What happened after they discovered that?
- 9 A. During the suppression efforts, while they were inside the
- 10 building, another device functioned on the back side of the
- 11 building and a fire ensued.
- 12 **Q.** Were they ultimately successful in controlling the fire?
- 13 **A.** Yes.
- 14 | Q. How extensive was the damage before they could control it?
- 15 **A.** The damage -- the two-story office building was destroyed,
- 16 and the fire spread along the roof assembly towards the main
- 17 portion of the building.
- 18 \mathbf{Q} . Now, you said you didn't get there until the day after the
- 19 | fire. Did you learn whether investigators had discovered
- 20 anything significant the first day?
- 21 **A.** Yes.
- 22 **Q.** What did they discover?
- 23 A. The two detectives from the Eugene Police Department had
- 24 processed the area of the entrance alcove. It was an area
- 25 just to the outside of the window and door. During the

- processing, they found the characteristic melted plasticremains of two plastic buckets.
- 3 Q. Did you prepare a diagram of the scene in this case?
- 4 **A.** Yes, I did.
- 6 A. Yes, I do.
- 7 **Q.** Is that what was prepared?
- 8 **A.** Yes.
- 9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 251.
- 10 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 11 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 12 (Exhibit No. 251 admitted.)
- 13 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 14 **Q.** What does this show?
- 15 **A.** This is a very rough diagram of the office building
- 16 showing the entrance alcove. And location No. 1 is where the
- 17 debris was recovered by the detectives from the Eugene police
- 18 department. They had moved debris from that location to the
- 19 area where I call the debris pile, where there's a circle and
- 20 | 14.
- 21 On the back side of the building, you see location 2 next
- 22 to a gas meter, and you see items 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 which
- 23 corresponds to evidence that was discovered when we processed
- 24 that area on the May 10th.
- 25 **Q.** How does location 2 relate -- you said a second fire broke

```
out while firefighters were fighting the first fire?
 1
        That is that location.
 2
    Α.
        At location 2?
    Q.
        Yes.
   Α.
 5
        Take a look at 252-A and tell me if you recognize that.
    Q.
        That is a photograph showing the front of the building.
   A.
 7
    In the center is the alcove entrance to the office.
8
             MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers Exhibit 252A.
9
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
10
             THE COURT:
                          Admitted.
11
                     (Exhibit No. 252-A admitted.)
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
12
13
        Could you point -- you referred to an entrance alcove a
14
    moment ago. Could you point that out for us?
15
        Right above the red line in the center of the burn
16
    pattern.
        Would you take a look at 252-B and tell us what that is?
17
18
        That is a closer-up photograph of that area of the alcove.
19
             MR. FRIEDMAN:
                            Government offers 252-B.
             MR. FOX:
20
                       No objection.
21
             THE COURT:
                          Admitted.
22
                     (Exhibit No. 252-B admitted.)
23
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
24
        So that's again the alcove where the first device was
25
    found?
```

```
1
        The very dark area in the center of the photograph.
   A.
 2
        Would you look at 252-E?
    Q.
        Yes.
   Α.
        Do you recognize that?
        Yes.
 5
   Α.
   Q.
        What is that?
 7
        That is the plastic remains discovered in the area of the
8
   al cove.
9
             MR. FRIEDMAN:
                             Government offers 252-E.
10
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
11
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
12
                     (Exhibit No. 252-E admitted.)
13
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
        When you say plastic remains, to which part of that
14
15
    photograph are you referring?
        Right there, that area within the circle and center of the
16
    pi cture.
17
18
        Would you look at 252-H? Tell us what that is a picture
19
    of.
20
        This is a picture of those plastic remains removed from
21
    that area of the alcove.
22
             MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 252-H.
23
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
```

THE COURT:

Admitted.

(Exhibit No. 252-H admitted.)

24

- 1 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 2 Q. Agent Comery, do you see any items you find significant in
- 3 the remains shown in that picture?
- 4 **A.** Yes.
- 5 Q. Can you tell us what you see?
- 6 A. Yes, on the right-hand side you see a handle for a
- 7 | five-gallon bucket. In the center of the photograph, you see
- 8 | the metal remains of a bell housing for a 60-minute timer.
- 9 Above that to the right you see the remains of a 9-volt
- 10 | battery, and over to the left upper portion you see another,
- 11 called a bell housing, which is the interior of the 60-minute
- 12 | timer.
- 13 Q. What does the fact you see two bell housings tell you?
- 14 **A.** It indicates that two mechanical timers were used in this
- 15 devi ce.
- 16 Q. Then would you look at Exhibit 252-K and tell me what that
- 17 | is?
- 18 A. This is a photograph of the back side of the office
- 19 building, showing the gas meter and right hidden from view is
- 20 the area of location 2 where the second device was located.
- 21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 252-K.
- 22 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 23 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 24 (Exhibit No. 252-K admitted.)
- 25 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

- 1 Q. You said hidden from view is location 2. Can you tell us
- 2 | where that would be if it were not totally hidden?
- 3 \mathbf{A} . It would be to the right of that red line. There's a
- 4 corner there and another corner.
- 5 Q. Would you take a look at 252-M and tell us what that
- 6 | shows?
- 7 A. It shows the corner where debris from an incendiary device
- 8 was found on the back side of the building.
- 9 **o.** Location 2?
- 10 **A.** Yes.
- 11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 252-M.
- 12 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 13 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 14 (Exhibit No. 252-M admitted.)
- 15 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 16 Q. Agent Comery, do you see anything significant in the
- 17 | photograph of Location 2?
- 18 A. Yes, on left-hand side you can see a metal handle from a
- 19 five-gallon bucket and the right hand, right side, a metal
- 20 | handle from a five-gallon bucket. In the center, a bell
- 21 housing from a timer. And the very center of the two, remains
- 22 of plastic. I can't tell if it's -- I won't call it --
- 23 Q. We have a closer up. I will ask you to look at 252-N.
- 24 Tell me if you recognize that.
- 25 **A.** Yes, I do.

- Q. Is this a closer-up photograph of the same remnants?
- 2 **A.** Yes.

1

3

- MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 252-N.
- 4 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 5 THE COURT: Admitted.
 - (Exhibit No. 252-N admitted.)
- 7 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 8 **Q.** Agent Comery, can you point out the important components 9 seen in this photograph?
- 10 A. The two bucket handles on the left and right. The bell
- 11 housing on the upper left-hand side. The bell housing from a
- 12 60-minute timer. I have to clarify that is a 9-volt battery
- 13 in the center. And then the remains of another 60-minute
- 14 timer is over to the right.
- 15 Q. So again, two timers?
- 16 A. Correct.
- 17 Q. Did you infer anything from that?
- 18 A. It appears that they w-e-r-e. If you remember in other
- 19 instances, the timers have been the weak link in the devices
- 20 and hadn't functioned properly. This time it appears they are
- 21 d-e-s-i-g-n-e-d, they have two timers; one is a backup,
- 22 obviously to ensure that the devices will function.
- 23 Q. So different type of fail-safe mechanism from what we saw
- 24 in A, B, and C?
- 25 **A.** Yes.

- 1 Q. Would you take a look at 252-P and tell me if you
- 2 recognize that?
- 3 **A.** Yes, I do.
- 4 **Q.** Can you tell me what that is?
- $5 \mid \mathbf{A}$. That is showing damage to the first floor office of the
- 6 building.
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 252-P.
- 8 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 9 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 10 (Exhibit No. 252-P admitted.)
- 11 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 12 **Q.** Agent Comery, did you determine the total damage to
- 13 Childer's caused by this fire?
- 14 A. I am aware of an estimate.
- 15 **Q.** Can you tell us what that is?
- 16 A. I believe it's over \$1.2 million; just approaching \$1.2
- 17 | million.
- 18 Q. Was testing done of samples you recovered from locations 1
- 19 and Locations 2?
- 20 **A.** Yes.
- 21 **Q.** What were the results of that testing?
- 22 **A.** Came back positive for the presence of gasoline and heavy
- 23 | petroleum distillate.
- 24 Q. Once again, did you download a communiqué related to this
- 25 | fire from the Internet?

Yes. 1 Α. 2 Would you look at 253? Do you recognize that? Α. Yes, it's a copy of the same type of communiqué downl oaded. 4 5 MR. FRI EDMAN: Government offers 253. MR. FOX: No objection. 6 7 THE COURT: Admitted. 8 (Exhibit No. 253 admitted.) BY MR. FRIEDMAN: 10 This is a shorter communiqué. Could I just ask you to read the three paragraphs we have there? 11 12 "ALF Celebrates Mother's Day, Eugene, Oregon, USA. 13 In honor of Mother Earth and all the cows who have their 14 babies stolen from them to help furnish the meat and dairy 15 industries, the Animal Liberation Front chose Mother's Day 16 1999 to pay a visit to Childer's Meat Company on Airport Road 17 in Eugene, Oregon. 18 "Using 20 gallons of a diesel fuel unleaded mixture, four 19 5-gallon buckets were strategically placed near the two-story 20 office building containing the company's business records and 21 along the main building near a natural gas line. Using two 22

25 "As long as companies continue to operate and profit off

there was plenty of time to leave town before the Mother's Day

kitchen timer delays, with another two timers as back up,

celebration really ignited.

23

- 1 of Mother Earth and Her sentiment animal beings, the Animal
- 2 Liberation Front will continue to target these operations and
- 3 their insurance companies until they are all out of business.
- 4 "Happy Mother's Day."
- $5 \mid \mathbf{Q}$. Agent Comery, the second matter has some details about the
- 6 devices used in this fire. Is what's written there consistent
- 7 | with the evidence you had seen?
- 8 A. Yes, we found the remains of four five-gallon buckets and
- 9 the remains of four timers, mechanical kitchen timers.
- 10 | Q. Did you read an opinion as to the cause and origin of this
- 11 | fi re?
- 12 **A.** Yes.
- 13 Q. Can you tell us?
- 14 A. Yes, two discreet areas of origin, one being in the alcove
- 15 entryway, and the other on the back side of the building near
- 16 the gas meter. And the cause of the fire was the functioning
- 17 of introduced incendiary devices igniting the fuels of the
- 18 | incendiary devices.
- 19 Q. Did you also participate in investigating a fire that took
- 20 | place at an office for Boise Cascade on December 25, 1999?
- 21 A. Yes, I did.
- 22 **Q.** The fire that day was not necessarily your investigation?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- 24 **Q.** When did you arrive on the scene?
- 25 A. I arrived December 27.

- 1 **Q.** Can you tell us what Boise Cascade is?
- 2 A. Boise Cascade is a timber harvesting and timber milling
- 3 operation and they produce paper products also.
- 4 **Q.** What was this building?
- 5 **A.** This was just an office building for their operations.
- 6 Q. Did you learn when this fire had broken out?
- 7 **A.** Yes, I did.
- 8 **Q.** What did you learn?
- 9 A. The fire came in at approximately 4:00 in the morning when
- 10 an interior fire alarm, fire detection system functioned.
- 11 **Q.** What happened after the fire alarm went off?
- 12 A. Cook County Fire District No. 1 responded and discovered
- 13 the building with a fully involved roof fire.
- 14 | Q. Do you have any idea how long it took to contain -- put
- 15 out the fire?
- 16 **A.** No, I don't.
- 17 Q. How extensive was the damage?
- 18 A. The whole roof assembly was destroyed and of course in
- 19 putting out the fire, all the first floor was destroyed by
- 20 water and heat.
- 21 **Q.** This was a one-floor building?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- 23 Q. Was an accelerant canine used in investigating this fire?
- 24 A. Yes, Oregon State Police Detective Moe Austin and his
- 25 Canine Kent responded to the scene on February 27.

- 1 o. What were the results of that?
- 2 **A.** He ran the dog around the exterior of the building and the
- 3 dog alerted at the northwest entrance and the southwest
- 4 entrance.
- 5 **Q.** You prepared a diagram, I take it?
- 6 A. Yes, I did.
- 7 Q. Would you look at Exhibit 261? Do you recognize that?
- 8 A. Yes, that's a portion of the diagram I drew.
- 9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 261.
- 10 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 11 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 12 (Exhibit No. 261 admitted.)
- 13 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 14 | Q. Can you tell us what that diagram shows?
- 15 **A.** The key points are the areas designated northwest
- 16 entrance, where there is an A, which corresponds to where
- 17 | evidence of an incendiary device was discovered; and then the
- 18 | southwest entrance B, where the evidence of an incendiary
- 19 device was discovered.
- 20 | Q. Are those the two areas to which -- and I forget the dog's
- 21 name -- to which the canine alerted?
- 22 A. Yes, that's where Kent alerted.
- 23 Q. Would you look at 262-C and tell us whether you recognize
- 24 | that?
- 25 **A.** Yes, I do.

```
In general terms what is that?
 1
 2
        It depicts the area I just described, the northwest and
    southwest entrance area.
             MR. FRIEDMAN: The Government offers 262-C.
 4
 5
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
 6
 7
                     (Exhibit No. 262-C admitted.)
8
   BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
        Can you show us where on this diagram --
10
       Over on the --
   Α.
11
        -- where the area is?
        On the left-hand side is the northwest entrance, and
12
13
    that's where A is. On the right-hand side behind that bush is
    southwest entrance where B was.
14
        Look at 262-E and tell me what that is.
15
    Q.
16
        Is that a closer-up photograph of the northwest entrance?
             MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 262-E.
17
18
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
19
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
20
                     (Exhibit No. 262-E admitted.)
21
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
22
        So this is the corner to the entrance, basically?
    Q.
23
   Α.
        That is correct.
24
        Is there anything significant about the burn pattern here?
```

Yes, what we see is heavy damage to the lower portion of

25

Α.

- 1 the wall in the corner, inconsistent there is no drop down in
- 2 the area that would have ignited that, and there's burning up
- 3 to the soffit, and then the roof above the area is destroyed.
- 4 Of course the window has failed and the fire has entered in
- 5 that area, too.
- 6 Q. Would you look at 262-G and tell me what is that a picture
- 7 of?
- 8 **A.** I processed this area, and this is where I find the
- 9 remains of melted plastic.
- 10 Q. Is this area the corner we just looked at?
- 11 **A.** Yes.
- 12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 262-G.
- 13 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 14 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 15 (Exhibit No. 262-G admitted.)
- 16 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 17 Q. You said you found melted plastic in this area. Can you
- 18 show us what it is you are referring?
- 19 A. Yes, this area in the center of the photograph is melted
- 20 plastic. The substrate in that area was just bark chips. The
- 21 plastic had melted and adhered to some of the bark chips.
- 22 Q. Do you see any other items of significance in that photo?
- 23 A. I believe another photo would be advantageous.
- 24 Q. Before we move to the next one, can you see any bucket
- 25 | handles in here?

- 1 A. Yes. There's wiring and handles.
- $2 \mid \mathbf{Q}$. Turn to Exhibit 262-H, and what's that a photograph of?
- 3 A. This is the material after it was removed from the area in
- 4 the corner.
- 5 **Q.** Same material we just saw?
- 6 A. Correct.
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 262-H.
- 8 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 9 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 10 (Exhibit No. 262-H admitted.)
- 11 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 12 Q. Can you tell us what you see in the photograph?
- 13 **A.** Yes, again there is the plastic on the upper portion of
- 14 the photograph. You can see the handle on the left-hand --
- 15 another metal handle for another five-gallon bucket on the
- 16 right. There's the remains of two timers; one on the lower
- 17 | left and one towards the center. You can see the springs and
- 18 some of the housing, remains of two 9-volt batteries, one
- 19 between the two timers and one below the timer. There's also
- 20 the remains of the plastic bag.
- 21 Q. So again, two timer mechanisms at Childer's?
- 22 A. That's correct, and two batteries.
- 23 Q. So an extra level of fail-safe basically, redundancy in
- 24 the timing mechanism and in the batteries?
- 25 **A.** And in the igniters, yes.

- 1 Q. After you processed area A, did you turn to area B?
- 2 A. That's correct.
- $3 \mid \mathbf{Q}$. Would you look at Exhibit 262-M and tell me what that is?
- 4 **A.** Yes, this is -- I have removed the debris atop the ground
- 5 and found the melted plastic remains that's adhered to the
- 6 bark chips.
- 7 \mathbf{Q} . Can I take you back a moment; is this a photograph of area
- 8 as you are processing it?
- Pla. Yes.
- 10 MR. FRIEDMAN: The Government offers 262-M.
- MR. FOX: No objection.
- 12 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 13 (Exhibit No. 262-M admitted.)
- 14 BY MR. FRIFDMAN:
- 15 **Q.** Can you tell what this is showing in area B?
- 16 A. This is showing the melted remains of plastic. You can
- 17 see a handle in the upper right-hand corner. There's
- 18 associated wiring toward the center of the debris.
- 19 Q. Can you look at 262-0 and tell me what that is a
- 20 photograph of?
- 21 A. This is a photograph of some of the debris and componentry
- 22 separated or discovered in or on top of that plastic.
- 23 **Q.** In area B?
- 24 **A.** Yes.
- 25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 262-0.

1 MR. FOX: No objection. THE COURT: 2 Admitted. 3 (Exhibit No. 262-0 admitted.) BY MR. FRIEDMAN: 4

- 5 Agent Comery, could you tell us what these items of componentry are?
- 7 A. Yes, we see the bell housing and spring of a mechanical 8 timer on the upper left, and another bell housing for a 60-minute timer in the right. We see a casing for a 9-volt 10 battery, the upper center and another casing for a 9-volt 11 battery below that.
- To the left of that is actually the interior of a 9-volt 12 battery which is similar to a AAA battery. You also see two alligator clips. Then the remains of a sponge in the upper right-hand corner.
- 16 Are these components you found in area B consistent with 17 what you found in area A?
- 18 Α. Yes.

13

14

- 19 Was testing done of samples recovered from both areas A
- 20 and B?
- 21 Yes, it was. Α.
- 22 What did that show? 0.
- 23 Some of the samples came back positive for the presence of 24 gasoline and heavy petroleum distillate.
- 25 After this, did you obtain a copy of a communiqué issued

```
in connection with this fire?
 1
 2
        Yes.
   Α.
   Q.
        Would you take a look at 263? Do you recognize that?
        Yes, a communiqué claiming responsibility for this fire.
 4
   Α.
 5
             MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 263.
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
 6
 7
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
8
                      (Exhibit No. 263 admitted.)
   BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
        Agent Comery, would you just read this communiqué for the
10
   jury also?
11
       "Animal Liberation Frontline Information Service.
12
                                                            FIF
13
    fires up Boise Cascade's HQ Communique.
        "Communi qué, December 25, 1999. Boi se Cascade has been
14
15
    very naughty. After ravaging the forests of the Pacific
16
    Northwest, Boise Cascade now looks towards the virgin forests
17
    of Chile.
               Early Christmas morning, elves left coal in Boise
18
    Cascade's stocking. Four buckets of diesel and gas with
19
    kitchen timer delay destroyed their regional headquarters in
20
    Monmouth, Oregon. Let this be a lesson to all greedy
21
   multinational corporations who don't respect their ecosystems.
    The elves are watching. Earth Liberation Front."
22
23
      Is the information in here about the diesel and gas and
24
    the number of buckets and kitchen timers -- is that all
25
```

consistent with the physical evidence you found?

- 1 **A.** Yes.
- 2 **Q.** As part of your investigation, did you see an estimate of
- 3 the amount of damage to this Boise Cascade office?
- 4 **A.** Yes.
- 5 **Q.** What was the amount?
- 6 **A.** Approximately \$1.6 million.
- 7 | Q. Would you take a look at 262-Q and tell me what that is?
- 8 A. That is a photograph of some of the damage to the
- 9 bui I di ng.
- 10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 262-Q.
- MR. FOX: No objection.
- 12 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 13 (Exhi bi t No. 262-Q admitted.)
- 14 BY MR. FRIFDMAN:
- 15 Q. Agent Comery, did you reach an opinion as to the cause of
- 16 this fire and the origin?
- 17 **A.** Yes.
- 18 **Q.** Would you tell us what that opinion is?
- 19 A. There were two discreet areas of origin, one at the
- 20 | northwest entrance and one at the southwest entrance. The
- 21 | fire was caused by the functioning of incendiary devices at
- 22 each area which ignited the introduced ignitable liquids.
- 23 **Q.** One last fire, Agent Comery. Did you participate in
- 24 | investigating a fire at Superior Lumber?
- 25 A. Yes, I did.

- 1 Q. When did that fire take place?
- 2 **A.** January 2, 2001.
- 3 **Q.** What is Superior Lumber?
- 4 A. Superior Lumber is a timber harvesting corporation, and it
- 5 also has a mill in Glendale, Oregon.
- 6 Q. This was the headquarters of Superior Lumber that was
- 7 | burned; is that correct?
- 8 A. The building was the office.
- $9 \mid \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}$ The office. When did you arrive on the scene?
- 10 **A.** Late on the afternoon of the second.
- 11 Q. Were you there for more than one day?
- 12 A. Yes, I was.
- 13 Q. What did you learn about when that fire broke out?
- 14 A. The fire occurred shortly after 2:00 in the morning on the
- 15 | second.
- 16 **Q.** In general terms, how extensive was the damage?
- 17 A. There was two areas of damage, heavy damage; one was by
- 18 the break room, patio area; and the other was by the computer
- 19 room, an office area on the other side of the building.
- 20 Q. Did the investigators have an accelerant at this fire?
- 21 **A.** Yes, they did.
- 22 **Q.** What happened when that can ne was used?
- 23 A. Moe Austin ran Kent, and Kent alerted to two areas; one
- 24 over by the exterior of the computer room, and the other over
- 25 by the patio.

- 1 **Q.** Were those the areas you had noted extensive fire damage?
- 2 **A.** Yes.
- $3 \mid \mathbf{Q}$. Could you smell the accelerant or gas yourself?
- 4 A. The one outside the computer room was very strong odor of
- 5 | gasol i ne.
- 6 Q. Did you prepare a diagram of Superior Lumber?
- 7 A. Yes, I did.
- 8 Q. Would you look at 281 and tell me if that's that diagram?
- 9 **a.** Yes, it is.
- 10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 281.
- MR. FOX: No objection.
- 12 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 13 (Exhibit No. 281 admitted.)
- 14 BY MR. FRIFDMAN:
- 15 **Q.** Could you describe what this diagram shows, Agent Comery?
- 16 A. This is showing the perimeter of the office building.
- 17 There's two areas of interest. One is just to the upper right
- 18 of the east addition. You can see it says evidence No. 1,
- 19 evidence 2, evidence No. 3. That's where we recovered the
- 20 remains of an incendiary device. The other is on the back
- 21 side, right above the breakroom, on the concrete patio and you
- 22 can see an area where it's marked evidence 5, with arrows for
- 23 evidence 6 and 7.
- 24 Q. Would you look at 282-B and tell me what that's a
- 25 | photograph of?

1 A. This is a photograph of the area of burning on the eastside, just outside the computer room.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 282-B.

4 MR. FOX: No objection.

THE COURT: Admitted.

(Exhibit No. 282-B admitted.)

7 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

5

- 8 | Q. This is the area outside the computer room?
- 9 A. That's correct. The computer room is right behind the
- 10 corner there.
- 11 **Q.** Diagonally inside, basically?
- 12 **A.** Correct.
- 13 Q. What do you find significant about the damage shown in the
- 14 | pi cture?
- 15 **A.** This fire pattern is significant because, again, we see
- 16 isolated low burning, and we don't see the associated drop
- 17 down from above that would cause that low burning. The
- 18 pattern goes up the walls. Again, the pattern is in the area
- 19 where there's a corner, in an area where there's windows that
- 20 would fail and also under an overhang.
- 21 Q. Would you look at 282-C and tell me what that is a picture
- 22 of?
- 23 A. Is that a close-up picture of the corner of the ground,
- 24 the corner of the ground there.
- 25 MR. FRIEDMAN: The Government offers 282-C.

```
1
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
 2
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
 3
                     (Exhibit No. 282-C admitted.)
   BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
 4
        Then 282-D.
 5
   Q.
        This is another close up of the corner. We removed the
 7
    debris that was atop the ground and we discovered the remains
8
   of an incendiary device.
9
             MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 282-D.
             MR. FOX:
10
                       No objection.
11
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
12
                    (Exhibit No. 282-D admitted.)
13
   BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
14
       When you say the remains of an incendiary device, what are
15
   you referring?
16
        The flagging is on the handle. Also you can see the
17
    lifted plastic. Again right in the corner that I have circled
18
    in the center of the photograph, you can see the unusual
19
    degree of burning on the base of the wall where the siding
20
    itself is burned off.
21
        Can you look at 282-E; do you recognize that?
        Yes, this is when we removed that large piece of debris
22
23
    and turned it over.
                            Government offers 282-E.
24
             MR. FRIEDMAN:
25
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
```

```
THE COURT: Admitted.
 1
 2
                     (Exhibit No. 282-E admitted.)
 3
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
 4
        Could you tell us what this picture shows?
 5
        This shows the characteristic preserved bottoms of
    Α.
    five-gallon buckets; we have two of them. The other thing of
 7
    interest is the remains of two plastic Ziploc containers, one
8
    in the center of the photograph, and one at the bottom left of
    the bucket remains.
        At this point in your investigation, were you able to
10
11
    determine why those Ziploc containers were here with these
    remnants?
12
13
        Yes.
    Α.
        Would you look at Exhibit 282-F?
14
15
        What is a photograph of?
16
        That is a photograph depicting -- it shows the remains of
    a matchbook from the debris.
17
18
        This is from the same debris which you were looking a
19
    moment ago?
20
        Correct.
    Α.
21
             MR. FRIEDMAN:
                             The Government offers 282-F.
22
             MR. FOX:
                       No objection.
23
             THE COURT:
                         Admitted.
24
                     (Exhibit No. 282-F admitted.)
25
    BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
```

- 2 **A.** The two things you can see, the remains of the handle of
- 3 the five-gallon bucket in the upper right hand corner, and the
- 4 | matches in the center of the photograph. The photograph is
- 5 upside down, and that's why the perspective is off.
- 6 Q. I am not sure that helps too much, but thank you.
- 7 Turning to Exhibit 282-H, can you tell us what is that a
- 8 | photograph of?
- 9 A. This is the west side of the break room showing the patio
- 10 and the entrance to the break room.
- 11 Q. So this is the second area in which you found -- second
- 12 area to which the accelerant dog had alerted?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 282 H.
- 15 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 16 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 17 (Exhibit No. 282-H admitted.)
- 18 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 19 **Q.** Would you look at 282-1, and tell me what that is?
- 20 A. This is a close up of that, after the debris had been
- 21 removed, that had been placed on top of the patio.
- 22 Q. Is there anything significant here about the burn pattern?
- 23 A. Yes, again we see the uncharacteristic low burning of the
- 24 | walls that is not associated with the normally occurring fuel
- 25 in the area. And then the fire entered the building through

- the glass doors, and then there's been heavy burning within the break room itself.
 - **Q.** How are you able to tell the fire entered through the glass doors?
- A. Because you read the fire patterns, and the initial fire investigation team mistook the patterns and actually thought the fire was originating within the break room. That's why in the first photograph you can see the debris is piled on the patio.
 - When we came, we noticed the characteristic. If the fire had been in the break room, the patterns coming out that door would have been different.
- 13 **Q.** Would you turn to Exhibit 282-K and tell me what is that a photograph of?
 - **A.** This is a photograph of the debris that was discovered on the concrete patio by that entrance to the break room.
 - MR. FRIEDMAN: The Government offers 282-K.
- 18 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 19 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 20 (Exhibit No. 282-K admitted.)
- 21 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

4

10

11

12

15

16

- 22 **Q.** Can you tell us what that photograph shows?
- 23 **A.** Yes, on the lower right-hand side there is the plastic 24 cover for a five-gallon bucket. Then in the center of the 25 photograph are the metal handles for two five-gallon buckets.

- 1 And then in the center of the photograph you can see the
- 2 remains of a D-cell battery.
- 3 **Q.** Would you look at 282-L and tell us what is that a
- 4 photograph of?
- 5 A. This is a photograph of that plastic debris that has been 6 removed from the patio and flipped over.
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 282-L.
- 8 MR. FOX: No objection.
- 9 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 10 (Exhibit No. 282-L admitted.)
- 11 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 12 Q. Agent Comery, can you go through and tell us the items of
- 13 | significance you see in that photograph?
- 14 A. On the left-hand side is the plastic cover for the bucket.
- 15 In the center and right-hand side are the bottom remains of
- 16 five-gallon buckets. The flag material is the handle. And
- 17 then right between the two buckets, again we see the plastic
- 18 remains of a Ziploc container.
- 19 Q. Is this the first fire of all the fires we've talked about
- 20 where you've seen Ziploc containers?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- 22 Q. Are there any additional components you found in this
- 23 device that are different from ones you found in earlier
- 24 devices?
- 25 **A.** In examining the debris, we found the remains of a fabric.

- 1 In one of the examinations of that fabric area, I found a wire
- 2 that was like a resistor, a heating element. That was very
- 3 unusual. Plus we found the remains of D-cell batteries, which
- 4 | we had not seen before.
- 5 | Q. Did you find -- are you familiar with components called
- 6 SCR, silicone controlled rectifiers?
- 7 **A.** Yes.
 - Q. Did you find any of those among the debris here?
- 9 A. I did not. The examination laboratory revealed remains of
- 10 one component that was identified as an SCR and one damaged
- 11 component that was very similar to an SCR.
- 12 Q. Did you also find, or did laboratory testing show the
- 13 presence of items consistent with road flares?
- 14 A. We did collect residue that the analysis in the lab
- 15 determined it was consistent with the post burn residue of a
- 16 road flare.
- 17 **Q.** Based on the presence of those items, are you able, or
- 18 were you able, to determine if there had been an evolution in
- 19 the devices?
- 20 | A. Yes, that, and also the item's circuit boards were clearly
- 21 | seen; and those circuit boards were identified to electronic
- 22 timers. And also we had the presence of AAA batteries, and
- 23 then also a watch battery that would be consistent with
- 24 electronic timers.
- 25 **Q.** If you compare this to one of the earliest devices, one of

- 1 | the devices at Cavel West when you started, in terms of how
- 2 the devices -- how those components would allow the devices to
- 3 | function, what changes had occurred over the span of these
- 4 | fires?
- $5 \mid A$. The primary difference is we've gone from a mechanical
- 6 kitchen timer with a fairly fragile igniter, which was the
- 7 | backup base of a light bulb. We have now gone into an
- 8 electronic timer. It is not as prone to failure as the
- 9 mechanical timer we saw a failure in some of the devices
- 10 previously.
- 11 The other thing is we are seeing dual systems: Dual
- 12 timers, dual igniters. That's just to ensure there is
- 13 ignition. The other thing is the presence of what the
- 14 | Laboratory determined was a Nordic brand electric socks had
- 15 been placed in amongst the componentry, which we speculate it
- 16 was placed to -- some people believe that when batteries get
- 17 | cold they lose their power. So we felt that might have been
- 18 the reason that was placed there.
- 19 **Q.** I assume testing was done of the remnants of these two
- 20 devi ces?
- 21 **A.** Yes.
- 22 **Q.** What did that testing show?
- 23 A. It came back positive for the presence of gasoline and a
- 24 heavy petroleum distillate.
- 25 Q. Would you look at 282-N; could you tell me what is that a

1 picture of? A. Yes, this is a picture just of the window in the area 2 where the first device was located on the eastside. MR. FRI EDMAN: The Government offers 282N. 4 5 MR. FOX: No objection. THE COURT: Admitted. 6 7 (Exhibit No. 282-N admitted.) 8 BY MR. FRIEDMAN: 9 Is it fair to say this is a photograph of the internal 10 damage near one of the devices? 11 Yes. Α. As part of your investigation, did you determine how much 12 13 total damage was done to the Superior Lumber office? 14 Α. Yes. 15 Q. What did you learn or determine? 16 The estimate was about \$1.2 million. Α. 17 Agent Comery, during the course of the investigation, did 18 law enforcement obtain a communiqué relating to this action? 19 Yes, they did. Α. 20 Would you look at Exhibit 283 and tell me if you recognize Q. 21 that? 22 Yes. A. 23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 283. 24 MR. FOX: No objection. 25 THE COURT: Admitted.

1 (Exhibit No. 283 admitted.) BY MR. FRIEDMAN: 2 Q. Can you read that? It's a communiqué sent by the Earth Liberation Front. 5 "We torched Superior Lumber in Glendale, OR, on January 1, 6 2001. Superior Lumber is a typical earth raper contributing 7 to the ecological destruction of the northwest. What happened 8 to them should shock no one. This year, 2001, we hope to see an escalation in tactics against capitalism and industry. 10 While Superior Lumber says, 'make a few items, and do it 11 better than anyone else, we say, 'choose an earth raper, and 12 destroy them'. ELF, Earth Liberation Front." 13 Did you reach a conclusion as to the cause of the fire in Superior Lumber? 14 15 Yes. Α. 16 What was that conclusion? 17 The fire was caused by the functioning of incendiary 18 devices placed in two separate areas; one on the east 19 exterior, and one on the west exterior. 20 Did you participate in searching a house of Nathan Block 21 and Joyanna Zacher in 2006? 22 Yes. Α. 23 Could you take a look at 562 and tell me if you recognize 24 that?

THE COURT: Is that 562?

- 1 MR. FRIEDMAN: It is, Your Honor.
- 2 BY MR. FRIEDMAN:
- 3 | Q. Do you have an item, Exhibit 562, in front of you?
- 4 **a.** Yes.
- 5 **Q.** Do you recognize that?
- 6 **A.** Yes, I do.
- 7 **Q.** Where have you seen that before?
- 8 A. At the house that you just described that we did the 9 search warrant.
- 10 **Q.** That's an item you found in the search of that house?
- 11 **A.** Yes, in the bedroom.
- 12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Government offers 562.
- MR. FOX: Your Honor, we had reached agreement with the Government, and I would like to take this up outside the presence of the jury.
- THE COURT: All right. We will recess -- take that up before we recess for the day.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: The Government has no further questions. Thank you, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Well, this might be a good time to break
 for the day. It's about four minutes to 4:00. I said I'd let
 you go at 4:00 each day, and so I will do that and have you
 back here ready to go again hopefully at 9:00, sitting right
 there.
- 25 As you go about your day, you are going to hear me say,

```
1
    until I sound like a broken record, don't discuss the case,
 2
    research anything, do anything about the case. Come back;
    have a good night's rest, and come back to receive the
    evi dence.
 4
 5
        So I will see you in the morning. Leave your books on the
 6
    chai r.
 7
        (Jury departed.)
8
             THE COURT: All right. You may be seated. Let me
9
    hear about this Exhibit 562.
10
             MR. FOX: I thought the Government was only going to
11
    offer one page in this Exhibit. There may have been some
12
    confusion because I got a whole stack of papers. I wasn't
13
    aware at the time that there were currently two different
14
    Exhi bi ts.
15
             THE COURT: Let me ask it another way; is it
16
    something the two of you should discuss?
17
                            No, we didn't realize that's what the
             MR. FRI EDMAN:
18
    defense was asking for, so we are happy to take out the one
19
    page.
20
             THE COURT: Let's do this. I will recess.
21
    have the two of you get together and decide on that page, and
    then I will take it up if you can't agree on it.
22
23
             MR. FOX: I think we will.
24
             THE COURT: Let me have the witness step down.
                                                              You
25
   can step down, sir.
```

1 Like I said, we will start at 9:00 in the morning. 2 don't know if there's something we can take up today; if 3 there's something there, we will deal with that. 4 Of course, I ask you, as to the witnesses, let the defense 5 know the witnesses you'll be calling tomorrow; the ones you 6 think you can get through in the same fashion. 7 MR. BARTLETT: I will. I should warn the Court I 8 anticipate, although I am not 100 percent certain, that there will be an issue the United States wants to bring up at 8:30. 10 THE COURT: As I said, I would like all of you here 11 at 8:30, including both attorneys and the Defendant, so we can 12 deal with that. Hopefully, Mr. Bloom, you make a list of 13 whatever you might get so you don't do that. 14 MR. BLOOM: I am really embarrassed. I apologize. 15 THE COURT: Give it some thought as you leave out the 16 door so we can take it up. Is it something we can't get to today? 17 18 MR. BARTLETT: No, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Then anything else we need to All right. 20 take up tonight? 21 MR. BLOOM: I don't believe so, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: I am good until about 9:00 tonight. 23 All right, then we will be at recess; we will see you 24 about 8:30. 25 THE CLERK: All rise, Court is in recess.

```
(The Court recessed to Wednesday, February 13, 2008,
 1
    at the hour of 9:00 a.m.)
 2
 3
                         CERTIFICATE
 4
 5
        I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
 6
 7
    the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
8
9
    /S/ Teri Hendrix
                                         May 2, 2008
   Teri Hendrix, Court Reporter
                                            Date
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```